A STUDY OF DIFFERENCES BETWEEN BHATTA AND PRABHAKARA SCHOOLS (MIMAMSA)

Published with the financial assistance from
the Rashtriya Sanskrit Samsthan, New Delhi

Dr. A RAMULU
M A, Ph D (Skt) M A (Tel) M A (Hist)
Lecturer in Sanskrit
OSMANIAUNIVERSITY, HYDERABAD

SRI RAMA NAMA KSETRAM
Jagadevpur Dt Medak A P
502 281

1995 Rs 52-00

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

Truth was passionately pursued in Ancient India The great seers of the past performed austere penance for realising truth As the result of that, they had actually visualized the Veda, the Divine Revelation It is an eternal light and illumines the paths of action and knowledge The systems of Indian Philosophy which deal with the paths are two '— one upholding the teaching contained in the former portions of the Veda, particularly the Brāhmaṇas , and the other that contained in the latter portions of it, viz , the Upaniṣads These two are, for this reason, respectively called Pūrva-Mīmāmsā and Uttara-Mīmāmsā The Pūrva-Mīmāmsā is usually called briefly, Mīmāmsā and Uttara-Mīmāmsā is known as Vedānta

The term 'Mīmāṁsā' is derived from the root 'Mān, to know' with the desiderative suffix, 'San', and it means the desire for knowledge The terms 'Mīmāṁsante', 'Mīmāmsā'[1] etc ,occur in the Veda and refer to the discussions of meaning of vedic passages dealing with the performance of sacrifices In due course, such discussions developed into a systematic Śāstra and owing obviously to the conspicuous development of other systems of philosophy, the Mīmāṁsā also came to be a full-fledged philosophic system with its own epistemology and ontology inaddition to being a systematization of ritual through a proper interpretation of the vedic texts

Jaimini [300 B C] wrote the Mīmāṁsā sūtras He refers in his sūtras to many Mīmāṁsā Ācāryas— Ātreya, Kārṣṇājani, Bādari, Bādarāyana, Asmarathya, Aitisāyana, Kāmukāyana,

1 Utsrjyam notsrjyam iti mīmāṁsante T S VI-2-6-4
Saiṣānandasya mīmāmsā bhavati T U P 2-6

Lābukāyana and Ālekhana The surmise of the modern scholars is that these are likely to have written similar works which are lost to us Jaimini's work contains 16 chapters Chapters 1 to 12 are called Mimāmsā Kānda and 13 to 16 are called Sankarsa Kānda The latter Kānda is also called *Devatā* Kānda in view of the discussions regarding deities conducted here in many of its Adhikaranas.

Mīmāmsā-sūtras are two thousand and seven hundred, arranged in twelve chapters The subjects of the twelve chapters are 1 Sources of Dharma [Pramāna], 2. Distinction [Bheda] of rites, 3 Ancillary [Śesa], 4 Obligatory [Prayukti], 5 Order of sequence [Karma], 6 The qualification of a sacrificer, etc [Adhikāra], 7 Extension of items in the model yāga to its modifications (Sāmānyato'tideśa), 8 Extension of items to individual rites [Visesato'tidista], 9 Adaptation of formulas, etc (Ūhā), 10 Exclusion (Bādhā), 11 Centralisation (Tantra) and 12 Extended Application (Prasanga)

The chapters are normally divided into four Pādas (pāda means a quarter) but chapters third, sixth and tenth are having Sarabha Pādas i e , eight pādas There are about a thousand topics of discussions (Adhikaranas) Each topic is treated in six parts 1) the subject to be explained (visaya) , 2) doubt [visaya] , 3) objection [Pūrvapaksa] , 4) reply [Siddhānta] , 5) Purpose [Prayojana] and 6) Consistency or relevence of topic [Sangati] Each topic sets forth a rule of interpretation [Nyāya] e g in Dharma jijñāsādhikarana, the rule of interpretation or Nyāya of impropriety of imagining an unseen fruit when there is a seen fruit is enunciated There are many such rules of interpretations Infact, these principles of interpretations are followed to give a verdict or draw a conclusion in legal works and Dharma Śāstra treatises Even the Vedānta, the final doctrine is established on the basis of these rules of interpretations

The purpose served by Mīmāmsā is threefold- 1) Evolving the rules of interpretations [Nyāyas] for the interpretation of

Vedic passages Therefore this system is called Vākyaśāstra 2) Giving authoritative rulings on sacrificial matters and fixing the correct procedure & the nature of sacrifices For this reason, it is called Karma Mīmāṃsā 3) It is also a system of Indian philosophy and hence discusses about epistemology and ontology In this connection the contribution made by Mīmāṃsā for the discussion of non-human origin of the Vedas and self validity of knowledge are invaluable Its concepts, of soul, liberation, each disolution (Pralaya) preceding the other importance of law, secondary position of the deities, ascertainment of meanings of words comprising the Vedas and Śāstras following the establishment meanings and words of common usage, etc, are peculiar

Jaimini must have flourished before Pāṇini the author of Aṣṭādhyāyī, because he has not followed Pāṇini's rules e g Dvāvos tadheti cet gavyasya tadādiṣu[JS] According to Pāṇini, Dvāvāpṛthivyoḥ and gavām ayanasya should be used instead of Dyāvon and gavyasya respectively

Three Vṛttis or short commentaries by Bodhāyana, Upavarṣa and Bhavadāsa seem to have been written on J S These are not available now Some extracts of Upavarṣa's Vṛtti are, however, incorporated in Śabara's Bhāṣya

The earliest commentary, which is available to us, on the J S is the Śabara-Bhāṣya by Śabarasvāmin In it there are references to previous Mīmāṃsakas who were perhaps authors of the commentaries which have not come down to us Śabarasvāmin must have flourished before Patañjali, the author of Mahābhāṣya on Pāṇini sūtras, because he has not followed Patañjali's rules In this context, Sri S Subramanya Śāstry makes these remarks[1]— In dissolving the compound Dharmajijñāsā Śabara adopted the caturthī vibhakti Dharmāya jijñāsā following Kātyāyana and not Patañjali who has condemned the Ṣaṣṭhī Samāsa in the caturthī vibhakti Kumārila, how-

1 p p Intro p 5

ever, following Patañjali has recommended the sixth case in dissolving the compound and interpreted the Bhāsya text, 'Dharmāya jijñāsā' as giving the conclusive meaning And Śabara's non mention of Patañjali[1] in this context markedly shows that he was prior to Patañjali since if he had seen Patañjali's Bhāsya, he would have atleast made a mention of that view." Hence we may approximately fix the date of Śabara at about 100 B C Śabarasvāmin is also designated as Āditvadeva, who changed to Śabara when he disguised himself as a forester for fear of Jaina prersecution[2]. Nothing is known about the place where the Bhāṣyakāra was born but, Dr Jha on the basis of certain passages from the Bhāṣya, suggests his being Northerner.

Bhartṛmitra (400 A D) wrote a commentary i e Tatvaśuddhi on the Bhāsya, but it is not extant now His views are referred to and refuted by Kumārila. According to Pārthasārathi, Bhartṛmitra introduced many wrong theories into the system and thus made it an atheist system[3]

The period of seventh century was the golden age in the history of Indian philosophy The great Śankara, Kumārila, Prahākara and others were born during this century They dedicated their lives to re-establish vedic culture which was eclipsed by Buddhism As we know the Buddhists had severally attacked the performances of vedic rites and rituals and there was every danger of losing the influence of vedic culture for ever It was, therefore, necessary that a revival should have taken place and the importance of the vedic rituals and rites vindicated against Buddhism This was perhaps the reason why Mimāmsā was once so widely read and several scholars wrote on it in their own individual way

---

1 on 1-1-5 J S Śabara mentions Pāṇini , and 10-8-1 both Pāṇini and Kātyāyana

2 Dr Jha supposes Ādityadeva to be the original name of Śabarasvāmin—see P M P 5

3 N R P. 3

Kumārila Bhaṭṭa (620-703) was a versatile scholar who wrote a commentary on Śabarabhāṣya It is in three parts 1. Śloka-vārtika (1. 1) 2 Tantra-vārtika (1. 2 to 3 8) and 3 Ṭup ṭīkā (4 - 12) Besides, he is also ascribed to be the author of one Bṛhaṭṭikā and another Madhyamaṭīkā These ṭikās are not available now The main object of Śloka-vārtika was to offer a strong criticism of Buddhistic doctrines and it deals mainly with the philosophical exposition Remaining two parts were intended for a detailed explanation of J S and S Bh Kumārila, while writing the independent commentary, founded a school of his own, which came to be recognised the Bhātta school.

Prabhākara (650-700), the founder of another school i e Prābhākara school or Guru school, wrote two independent commentaries on S Bh, i e Bṛhatī also called Nibandhana-ṭīkā and Laghvī, otherwise Vivaraṇa ṭīkā Prabhākara criticised the doctrines propounded by Kumārila and differed from him on numerous points The divergence starts from the very first sūtra itself Dr Jha is of the view that Prabhākara is more faithful to S Bh than Kumārila[1] and Prof. Hiriyanna also thinks that original teachingst of the Mīmāmsā is better preserved in the writings of Prabhākara [2] But so for as Bṛhatī is concerned, I cannot subcribe to this opinion On many occasions Prabhākara has given forced interpretations and has twisted the Bhāsya in order to suit his own views Prof Kuppuswami Sastry is of the view that Prābhākara school must have been represented in the anti-Kumārila period of Mīmāmsā, by writers like Bhartṛ mitra [3]

Opinions have been expressed regarding the teacher pupil relationship between Kumārila Bhatta and Prabhākara The title, 'Guru" of Prabhākara is explained by a curious incident Once when Kumārila had to explain an ambiguous passage, 'Atrāpi noktam tatra tu noktam iti dviruktam", he could not make out of the puzzle After sometime, one of his disciples, Prabhākara, solved the puzzle, 'Atra api na uktam tatra tu na uktam iti dvih uktam" and gave the

1 PM. p 5 2 OIP p 302 3 AIOC P II p 411

solution The teacher was immensely pleased with it and commended Prabhākara for his ingenious explanations by conferring on him the title, 'Guru' From that time onwards Prabhākara came to be known as Guru and his school as Gurumata

Kumārila and Prabhākara, the founders of the two schools gave a systematic form to the Mimāmsā, discussing in detail all the important philosophical topics which had been incidentally dealt with by Jaimini and Śabara. Almost the entire later Mīmāmsā literature came to be based on these two authors Even those who, coming after them, wrote direct commentaries on the J S belonged to either of these two schools. Scholars like Mandanamiśra, Umveka, Vācaspatimiśra, Pārthasārathi and Khandadeva were the foremost among the followers of the Bhātta school. Śālikanātha, Bhavanātha, Candra, Nandīsvara and Rāmānujācārya were the only followers of the Prābhākara school A third school was added to these two in the name of Murārimiśra whose views are generally refered to as Miśramata by the later writers[1]

Dr Umeś Miśra describes glorious past of the Prābhākara school,[2] thus "Of these two schools the Prābhākara school became more and more popular. It attracted the attention of scholars from different parts of the country There was hardly a scholar of Mīmāmsā who did not study and write on this school. But several of these scholars pre-

1 Murāri was a great Mīmāmsaka who held independent views distinct from those of Kumārila and Prabhākara on several topics of Pūrva-Mīmāmsā, which has led to the saying — 'Murāreh tritīyah panthāh' He is placed between the eleventh and the twelvth centuries A D Two works ascribed to him are available 1 The Tripādi nītinayana is a commentary on J S 1-2-4, 2. The Ekādaśādhyāyādhikarana deals with Tantra and Āvāpa which forms the subject matter of the eleventh chapter of the J S.

Citations in Śabara bhāṣya p 10

2 Jha commemoration vol i 242

served their own individuality and created several subdivisions under this school The reason why this school became so popular seems to be that, unlike the Bhātta school it gave more scope for independent reasoning" Sri P V Kāne also supports the view and shows epigraphical evidences for that[1] However, later the Bhātta school became more popular than the Prābhākara school and eclipsed it, Till the publication of the Prakarana-pañcikā and of Dr Jha's thesis on this school, the details concerning this school was practically restricted to the references given by the Bhāttās, etc

In this thesis, I propose to study the problems regarding differences between Bhātta and Prābhākara schools of Mīmāmsā in the context of epistemology, ontology and Śāstra topics In the course of discussions, an attempt is made to co-ordinate and evaluate the explanations regarding the differences provided by the schools themselves

As the literature of the schools is very vast, it has compelled me to limit the study to the selected works under each of the schools, the texts which are of basic importance and have consructive value only are selected for the present study I have selected as far as possible the works of the founders of these schools, as well as some celebrated works of each school, such as Śāstradīpikā, Prakaraṇapañcikā, etc The manuals, which contain the elaboration or compendium of what has been said in original texts of the schools and the works of modern scholars are also consulted for a clear and critical presentation of the subject matter

References to the concept of differences of the schools occar partly in the works dealing with particular schools or systems such as the Prābhākara Mīmāmsā, Epistemology of Bhātta school of Mīmāmsā, Karma Mīmāmsā, etc , or the standard works dealing with the history of Indian philosophy The problem however, is not studied independently

1 HDS V p 1192

and systematically. The present work is devoted mainly to what has been written by the Mīmāmsakas in their works In such cases, the author cannot claim originality in the real sense of the term But still, it is hoped that the work will fulfil a hitherto unsatisfied need of a systematic account of the nature and basis of the divergences of the two Mīmāmsā schools

The material presented is systemwise and topicwise. The Bhāṭṭa view is discussed first and is followed by the Prabhākara view

In the case of Sanskrit technical terms, the usually adopted English renderings have been accepted and the original terms are given in brackets to avoid confusion. I had to depart from the accepted translation sometimes, to make the meaning as clear as possible. However, when I found no translation which can retain the original shade of meaning, I preffered to retain the original Sanskrit term only

At the end of book I have given a list of works consulted during the preparation of this work In most of the cases, the important passages have been quoted in original in the foot-notes In some cases, to avoid elaboration, only the reference to the original texts is given

In this section, I will provide a list[1] of authors of Mīmāṃsā literature with their works, to give an idea of Bhatta's predominance over Prābhākaras The list describes about 119 authors who wrote some works on Mīmāmsā Of the 171 works whose titles are known to us, only 161 are available now, the remaining ones, if we know anything about them, are known through fragmentary references taken from the works of philosophers who addressed polemics toward their views Of the 161 works available in manuscript, 79 have been edited, some more than once, and 12 have been translated wholly or partially into English

LIST OF MĪMĀMSĀ AUTHORS AND WORKS

Date	Name	Place	Work/s
300 BC	Jaimini		Jaimini Sūtras (T)
100 BC	Upavaisa		V on J S
100 BC	Bodhāyana		V on J S
100 BC	Bhavadāsa		V on J S
57 BC	Śabarasvāmin		Śābara Bhāsya (T)
400 AD	Bhartrmitra		V on S Bh

PRĀBHĀKARA SCHOOL

650-720	Prabhākara	Kerala	Bṛhatī (E) Laghvī
690-760	Śalikanātha	Bengal	Ṛjvimalā on Bṛhatī(E)
			Dīpaśikhā on Laghvī
			Prakarana Pañcikā (E)
			Bhāsya pariśista (E)
1050 1150	Bhavanātha	—	Nayaviveka (E)

---

1 The list primerly based on Dr. Umesh Misra's critical Bibliography to PMIIS pp 5-68 and V. A. Ramasvami sastri's Intr to Tattva suddhi pp 1-149 Abbreviations used —

T Translated and Published M available in Manuscript (s)

E	Published	N	Nyāya	V	Vyākhyā
Bh	Bhatta	M	Mīmāmsā	JS	Jaimini Sūtras
SBh	Śabara Bhāṣya	TV	Tantra Vārtika	SD	Śastra Dīpikā
SV	Śloka Vārtika	MNP	M N Prakāsa	BD	Bhaṭṭa Dīpikā

1100	Candra (Gurumatācārya)	Mıthıla	Nayaratnākara (M) Amrta bındu (M)
1220	Nandīśvara		Prabhākara Vıjaya (E)
1400	Bhatta vısnu	?	N Tatvasangraha (M)
1400	Ravıdeva	?	Vıveka tatva on N vıveka (E)
1500-70	Varadarāja	Tamıl	Dīpıkā on N vıveka (M)
1750	Rāmānujācārya	Dharmapurı (AP)	Tatva rahasya (E), Nāyaka ratna on N ratnākara (E),
18 C	Govında Bhatta	?	M N sangraha (M)
18 C	Udayapūjyapāda	Malbar	Adhıkarana Ślokārtha dīpıkā (M)

BHĀṬṬA SCHOOL

620-680	Kumārıla Bhatta	Andhra	Śloka Vārtıka (T), Tantra Vārtıka (T), Ṭuptıkā (T), Brhattīkā, Madhyamatīkā
615-695	Mandana Mıśra	Mahısmatı	Vıdhıvıveka (E) Bhāvanā vıveka (E), Vıbhrama vıveka (E), M Sūtrānukramanī (E), Spotasıddhı (T)
700-760	Umveka (Bhavabhūtı)	?	Commentarıes on SV & Bhāvanā vıveka (E)
820-900	Vācaspatı Mıśra	Mıthıla	N kanıkā on Vıdhıvıveka (E), Tattvabındu (E)
1050 20	Pāthasārathı Mıśra	,,	N Ratna Mālā (E), Tantra ratna on Tuptıkā (E), Śāstra Dīpıkā (T)
11th C	Bhavadeva	Radha	Tautātımata tılaka on Tuptīkā (M)
11th C	Sucarıta Mıśra	Mıthıla	Kaśıkā on SV (E)

1170-12	Halayudha Bhatta	Bengal	M Śāstra Sarvasva (E)
1170-12	Someśvara Bhatta	—	N Sudhā on TV (E)
1200	Paritoṣa Miśra	Bengal	Ajitā on TV (E)
1200-00	Cidānanda	Kerala	Nītitatvāvirbhāva (M)
1230-00	Gangādhara	Śalmali	N Pārāyana on TV (M)
1269-69	Vedānta Desika	Kanchi	M' pādukā (E), Sesvara M (E)
1297-86	Mādhavācārya	Hampi	JN mālāvistara (E)
1350-00	Paramesvara I	Guruvayur	Jusadhvam Karanī & Svaditam Karanī on N Kanikā (M)
1400	Anantanārāyana	Bengal	Vijayā on Ajitā
1400	Parameśvara II	Guruvayur	V on Vibhrama viveka and Sphoṭasiddhi (M), Tatva vibhāvanā on Tatva biudu (E)
1400	Vallabhā Cārya	Andhra	P M Kārikas (M)
1450	Indrapati Ṭhākur	Mithila	M Palvala (M)
1450	Parameśvara III	Guruvayur	M Sūtrārtha sangraha (M), V on Kaśikī (M)
1478	Govinda Thakur	Mithila	Adhikaranamālā (M)
1500	LaugākṣiBhāskara	Andhra	Arthasangraha (T)
1500	Bhatta Keśava	,,	M Arthaprakāśa
1500-42	Raghunatha Bh	Bengal	M' ratna (M)
1500-75	Varadaraja	Tamil	Ranakabhavanā Karikāvivarana (M)
1513	Narayana Bh I	Benares	V on SD (M)
1520 93	Appayya Dikṣita	Kanchi	Vdidhirasāyana with Sukhopayojanī (E) Upakrama parākrama (E) Vādanakṣatrāvalī (E) Mayūkhāvalī on SD (E) Citrapata (E), Dharma (M) Paribhāsā (M)

1520	Venkateśvara Diksita	South	Vārtikabharana on Tuptīkā (M)
1539 97	Vijayenbra Tīrtha	Tanjore	N Adhvara dīpikā (M), M N kaumudī (M), Upasamhāra vijaya (M)
1543	Ramakrsna Bh	Benares	Siddhānta chandrikā on Śastra Dīpika (E)
1550-20	Śankara Bhatta	,,	Prakaśa on SD (M) M Bālaprakāśa (E) M Sārasangraha (E) Vidhirasāyana-dūsana (M)
1560-30	Nārāyana Bhatta II	Malabar	Nibandhanā on TV(M) Mānameyodaya IP (T)
1562	Devanātha Thā	Mithila	Adhikaraṇakaumudī M
1580-50	Āpadeva	M'rastra	M N prakāśa (T) Adhikaranacandrikā M
1580-50	Rājacūdāmaṇi Dīksita	Andhra	Tantra Śikhāmani on JS (M), Karpūra Vārtika on SD (M)
1590-60	Kamalākara Bhatta	M'rastra	Bhāvārtha on TV (M) Āloka on SD (M) Śāstramālā on JS (M)
1590-60	Dinakara Bhatta	M'rastra	Bh Dinakarī onJS (M)
1590-60	Venkatādhvarin	Kanci	Vidhitraya pritrāna (M) M Makaranda (M)
1600-50	Appayya Diksita II	Kanci	Tantrasiddhānta dīpikā M Visayasangraha dīpikā (M), Durūha Śikha (M)
1600-65	Khandadeva	Benares	Bh Dīpikā on JS (E) Bh Rahasya (E) Bh Kaustubha on Bhaṭṭa Dīpikā (E)
1600-70	Gopāla Bhaṭṭa	M'rastra	Vidhibhūsana (M)
1600-70	Jīvadeva	M'rastra	Bh Bhāskara (M)
1600-70	Kondadeva	M'rastra	Bh Matapradīpikā (M)
1600-70	Ramakrishna-Diksita	Kumbha-konam	M N darpana on JS (M)

1600-70	Raghavendra Sv-	M'Alaya	Bhātta Sangraha (E)
1600-70	Kavındrācārya	?	Vyākhyā on TV (?)
1600	Venkatesvara Dī	Tanjore	VārtıkābharanaonTT(E
1600	SomanāthaDıksıta	Andhra	Mayūkhamālıkā on Śāstra dīpıkā (E)
1600	Yajñanārāyana Dī	South	PrabhāmandanaonSD(E
1625 00	Ananta deva	M'rastra	Bhattālankāra on M Nyāya prakāsa (E)
1630-00	Ananta Bhatta	M'rastra	Vrtti on Sāstramālā (M) N Rahasya on JS (M)
1630-00	Vısveśvara Bhatta	M'rastra	Bhāttacıntāmanı (M) Kusumāñjalı on JS(M) Śıvārkodaya on SV(M)
1630-00	Kollur Nārāyana Śāstry	Andhra	M Sarvasva (M) Vıdhı vıveka (M) Vıdhı darpana (M)
1640-20	Śambhu Bhaṭta	Benares	Prabhāvalī on BD (E)
1650	Gadādhara Bh	Bengal	Vıdhısvarūpanırnay(M
1650	Vaıdyanātha Tatsat	?	Prabhā on Nyāya bındu (E)
1650	Pedda Dīksıta	Andhra	Bh Parıbhāsā (M)
1650	Nārayna tīrtha	Benares	Bh Bhāsā prakāśa (E)
1660	Narayana Sudhī	South	Bh Nayodaya (M)
1660	Nārāyaṇa Panḍıta	Calıcut	Mānameyodaya IIP(T)
1675-17	Mur'rı Mıśra	Mıthıla	Angatva Nıruktı (E)
17 Cetury	Nīlakanta Bhaṭta	Benares	M N Sangraha (M)
17 C	Śankara Bhatta	M'rastra	Bh Bhāskāra on JS (M)
17 C	Nārāyaṇa	South ?	Vıdhı Camatkāra (M)
17 C	Nārāyana	Kerala	Vısamagranthabhedık(M
17 C	Srīnıvsa Dāsa	South	Vıdhıratnāvalı (M)
17 C	Ramānuja Dāsa	South	Tantralaharī on JS (M)
1700-60	Annam Bhatta	Andhra	Subodhını on TV (M) Ranakojjīvını on Nyāyasudhā (M) Ranakabhāvanā krıkā vıvarana (M)
1700 90	Bhāskara Rāya	Andhra	Candrodaya on BD (M) Vādakutūhala (M)

1700-60	Krsna Yajvan	Andhra	M Paribhāsā (T)
1700-60	Yellu Bhatta	Andhra	Sūtra dīpikā (M)
1700-70	Rāmakrsna Dīksita	Malwa	Yuktisneha pūranī on Śāstra dīpikā (E)
1700-70	Vāsudeva Dīksita	Tanjore	Adhvara M kutūhala Vrtti on JS (E)
1725-75	Balam Bhatta	Andhra	Pista Paśu M (M)
1725	Brahmānanda Sa-	Bengal ?	M Candrikā on JS (M)
1760-30	Vancesvarayajvan	K konam	Bh Cintāmani on BD (E)
18C	Ahobila	South	Vākyārtharatnamālā with Tātparya Prakāśikā (M)
18 C	Anantācārya		Vidhisudhakara (M)
18 C	Annu Śastry	Paralam	Tantrasiddhānta sangraha (M)
18 C	Bālakrsnānanda Sa-	?	Nyāyāmoda (M)
18 C	Garudadhvaja	South	V[illegible]asangrahadīpikā
18 C	Mahadevavedāntin		Vyākhyā on JS (M)
18 C	Laksmanārya	Karnataka	Tantravilāsa (M)
18 C	Mukundānanda	Kerala	V on Nititatvāvirbhāva
18 C	Nīlakantha	Kerala	V on Nititatvāvirbhāva
18 C	Rāghavānanda		MSūtradīdhition JS(M)
	Sarasvati		M Stabaka (M)
18 C	Ramakrsna Udīcī Bhattācārya	South	M Adhikarana Kaumudī (M)
18 C	Ravi	Kerala ?	M Prameyasangraha M
18 C	Rameśvara	?	Vidhiviveka (M)
18 C	Subrahmanya		Śastropanyāsamālikā M
18 C	Uttamaślokatīrtha		Laghu nyāya sudhā on Tuptīkā (M)
18 C	VenkataNārāyana	Madurai	Vidibhūsana (M)
1850	Rāmesvara	Benares	Vihāravāpī on JS (M)
			Subodhinī on JS (M)
20th C	Dr Ganganath Jha	Gandha-vari	M Mandana on M Anukramanikā (E)
20th C	D T Tātācārya	Tanjore	M Abhyudaya (E)
			V on M Paribhāsā (E)
20th C	Sudarsanācārya	Punjab	Prakāśa on SD (E)

20th C	Krsnanatha Nyyaa Pancanana	Pūrva stali	V on M N P	(E)
20th C	Cinnasvami Śastri	Madras	V on MNP	(E)
20th C	Vamana Śastri Kinja Wadekar	Poona	Paśvālambhana M	(E)
20th C	Kevalānanda Sa-	Satara	M Kosa	(E)
hOth C	Vasudeva Śastri Abhayankar	Poona	Prabhā on M N P	(E)
1925	P Sūryanarayana Śastri	Vijaya-nagaram	Bhavaprakāśa on Bh Rahasya	(E)

(B) Some Critical works in English on Mīmāmsā

A B Keith	Karma Mīmāmsā	Calcutta	1923
Paśupatinātha	Introduction to PM	Calcutta	1923
P V Kane	History of PM System	Poona	1924
Chintamani	History of PM Śastra Thesis	Madras	1933
Ganganatha	PM in its sources	Benares	1964
Jha	Prabhākara school of M	Benares	1970
Govardhan P Bhat	Epistemolagy of the Bhatta school of PM	Varanasi	1962
Vacaspati	Theory of selfvalidity of Knowledge in Mīmāmsā	PhD thesis Calcutta	1967
D V Gorge	Citations in Śabara-bhāsya	Poona	1952
G V Devasthali	M the Vākya śāstra of Ancient India	Poona	1959

(C) Some Works, which include a chapter on Mīmāmsā

Maxmuller	Six systems of Indian philosophy		1899
S Radhakrsnan	History of Indian philosophy	London	1941
S N Das gupta	A History of Indian philosophy	Cambridg	1922
Hiriyanna	Out Lines of Indian philosophy	Britain	1932
	Essentials of Indian philosophy	London	1942
PV Kane	History of Dharma Śastra	Poona	1967
Umes Misra	History of Indian philosophy	Alhabad	1959
HT Cole brooke	Essays on the Religious and Philosophy of the Hindus	Delhi	1972
K K Diksit	Indian Logic	Vaisāli	1915
Śivakumar	Upamāna in Indian philosophy	Poona	1986
T M Srinivasan and Sri Laxmi	Sense Perception in Scince and Sastras	Sringeri	1968

MEANS OF VALID KNOWLEDGE

PERCEPTION

We shall turn to problems of epistemology first, later on we shall survey the antological categories We have chosen to treat epistemology before metaphysics because, the reality of the objects of knowledge is grounded in the means of knowledge only [Mānādhīnā Meyasiddhiḥ] This is most true of our own times, where all metophysical problems are attacked through an analysis of knowledge , and again, all philosophical criticism is usually based upon epistemological ground

The term 'Pramāna' derived from the root 'Mā' (with the prefix 'Pra') meaning 'to measure out' Pramā is a term designating valid knowledge The validity of a knowledge is grounded in a Pramāna, a means of valid knowledge The word 'Pramāna' has two expressed senses One is Pramā or valid knowledge and other Pramā-karana or means of knowledge Grammer admits of the formation of the word in both the senses According to Panini, the suffix here is 'lyut' i e 'Ana'[1] The suffix can be used without attaching any extra meaning to that of the root In this case the word Pramāṇa and Pramā are synonyms The suffix can also mean 'means', in which case the word expresses the meaning of means of right knowledge In the present context, the word is used in the latter meaning, viz , means of right knowledge

A means of knowledge is defined as the collection of all the conditions of right knowledge Jaimini, the Sūtrakara, employes the three attributes, viz , 1) absence of defects in the source

1 ल्युट् च PS 3-3-115 करणाधिकरणयोश्च PS 3-3-117.

[Aautpattika] 2) absense of contradictory knowledge [Avyatireka], and 3) Previously unacquired [Arthe' nupalabhdhe],[1] to the means of Dharma Hence it is clear that the constituents of a means of knowledge are— absence of defects in the source absence of contradiction and the apprehension of that which was not previously known

According to Sabarasvāmin, the bhāsyakāra, consciousness is the means of knowledge but, unlike the Buddhist, he holds that the result produced by the means of knowledge is different from the means itself This result is knownness (Jñātatā) of the object

The Buddhist gives definition of means of knowledge as, 'a non controdicted experience of an object hither to uncognised' (Anadhigatārthādhigantr Pramānam avisamvādi Jñānam][2] The criticism of Kumārila and his followers is directed against the Buddhist view that this definition is too comprehencive (Ativyāpta) and too narrow (Avyāpta) as it includes some cases of memory and excludes inferential knowledges of past and future objects under right knowledge because, some cases of memory possess efficiency and the inferential knowledges lack practical efficiency [3]

The Naiyāyika defines means of knowledge as, 'the instru ment of knowledge' [Pramā karanam Pramānam][4] Even thou there is no dispute about the definition but, we can see a controversy over the validity of restatement The Naiyāyika do not accepts validity to restatements According to him it does not possess any difference from the previous knowledge either in the determination of facts or in empirical usage Hence it should not be included in right knowledge But the Bhatta accepts validity to restatements like continuous streams of knowledge [Dhārā Vāhika Jñāna]

1 औत्पत्तिकस्तु शब्दस्यार्थेन सम्बन्ध तस्य ज्ञानमुपदेश , अव्यतिरेकश्चार्थेऽनुपलब्धे तत्प्रमाण JS, 1-1-5 औत्पत्तिकशब्देन कारणदोष निवृत्ति । अव्यतिरेकपदेन बाधप्रत्ययनिरास । अर्थेऽनुपलब्धे इत्यनुवादत्वम् ।
2 PV, 1-1 अविसंवादक ज्ञान सम्यग्ज्ञानम् । NBT, p, 17
3 KK, p, 102
4 प्रमाकरण प्रमाणम् । अत्र च प्रमाण लक्ष्य, प्रमाकरण लक्षणम् ।TB, p, 1

BHĀṬṬA VIEW

Kumārila Bhatta defines means of knowledge as that knowledge which is means in enabling us to apprehend that 'special luminosity' [Prakāśa Viśesa] which abides in the objects apprehenced[1] Pārthasārathi says that what constitutes means of knowledge is the knowledge of that which is not contradicted by a subsequent experience and which relates to something not previously apprehended [Kārana dosa bādhaka jnāna rahitam agṛhitagrāhi jnānam Pramānam][2] One may ask that in a continueous stream of knowledge [Dhārāvāhika Jnāna] [referring to the same object], we have fixing our attention on the object, different intellections of the same object, eg 'this is a book this is a book and so on', the intellections that are subsequent to that which is the first member of the series are merely a repetition and as such they [the later ones] cease to be valid Reply of the Bhāttas to this is that, even there, there is the knowledge of each succeeding element of time like, 'this' 'this', which was unknown, and because the existence of the book in the succeeding moment is not understood by the previous knowledge[3]

The Bhāṭṭa accepts six means of right knowledge They are perception [Pratyaksa], inference [Anumāna], verbal testimony [Śabda], analogy [Upamāna], Presumption [Arthāpatti] and non-apprehension [Anupalabdhi] The Materialist [Cārvāka] recognize only one means of right knowledge, viz, perception[4] He rejects the validity of inference on the ground that there is not sufficient warrant for believing in the truth of the pervasion [vyāpti] which forms it basis But this argument stultifies the Materialist's own position His conclusion that 'inference is not valid' is itself the result of induction, and points to a conviction that in one case, atleast, the relation of pervasion holds true

1 तस्माद्दृढ यदुत्पन्न नापि सवादमृच्छति ।
ज्ञानान्तरेण विज्ञानं तत्प्रमाण प्रतीयताम् ॥ SV, p, 103

2 SD, p, 45 3 ibid, p, 45

4 चार्वाकास्तावदेक द्वितयमपि पुनर्बौद्धवैशेषिकौ द्वौ
भासर्वज्ञश्च साख्यास्त्रितयमुदयनाद्या श्चतुष्क वदन्ति ।
प्राहु प्राभाकरा· पञ्चकमपि च वय तेऽपि वेदान्तविज्ञाः
षट्क पौराणिकास्त्वष्टकमभिदधिरे सम्भवैतिह्ययोगात् ॥ M M, p, 19

Buddhists say that as there are only two kinds of objects, so there can be only two kinds of means of right knowledge to grasp each of them And there is no third kind of object in addition to perceptible and inperceptible There can be nothing which is neither perceptible nor inperceptible Perception is able to grasp perceptible objects, and inference can grasp inperceptible hence, only two means of knowledge [1] Vaiśesikas also accept only two They include verbal testimony in inference Their argument is that in the form of a inference in which the words or the meanings of words in a sentence form the subject [Pakṣa], the connection of meanings remembered through those words forms the probandum [Sādhya], on account of group words possessing such accessories as verbal expectancy, etc, forms the reason, even like my sentence forms the example [2] Putting forword this inference, the vaisesika argues that while the verbal testimony can be had through inference But the Bhātta refutes this argument by pointing out dissimilar knowledges that arise respectively through inference and word If the argument of the vaiśesikas that verbal testimony also arises through inference, then the knowledge that arises through inference must be, 'I know this by inference' But this is dissimilar to the knowledge that rises among people, for it is observed that one gets the notion, 'I know this through verbal testimony', whenever verbal knowledge is gained. There fore, verbal knowledge is a distinct means of knowledge

Sānkhyas and Bhāsarvajna accept three means of right knowledge, viz, perception, inference and verbal testimony Other means of knowledge noted by other philosophers, according to Bhāsarvajna, could be included under these three [3] He argues later with great ingenuity that his system of three means of right knowledge does not, infact, go against Gautama's

1 प्रत्यक्षमनुमानञ्च प्रमाण हि द्विलक्षणम् । प्रमेय तत्र सिद्ध हि न प्रमाणान्तर भवेत् ॥ प्रमाणसमुच्चय, 1st chapter.

2 वाक्यानि स्वस्मारितार्थससर्गवन्ति, आकाक्षाद्युत्पादकशक्तिमत्वात् म ाक्यवत् ।

3 Nyāya sangraha Vārttika, p, 6

system of four Gautama first spoke of five sense organs in NS 1-1-12 and then in another place accepted the internal organ (mind) as the sixth sense organ This shows that, according to Bhāsarvajna, Gautama's enumeration of items was not always meant to be exact or even mutually exclusive of other lists Thus, alhough Gautama mentioned four means of right knowledge he would not have denied the fact there are only three [1] This argument is not satisfactory because it was criticized by his own Naiyāyikas Naiyāyikas accept four means of right knowledge [2]

The Prābhākara adds one more means of right knowledge, viz , presumption [Arthāpatti] to the list of means of right knowledge Their argument is that when we learn something and find it difficult to understand because of incompatibility we assume something else in order to understand it It is different from inferene, while in inference the probans (Hetu) cannot exist in the subject unless the probandum (Sādhya) does, in presumption the relation is reserved , the Probandum cannot exist in the subject unless the probans does

The Bhātta adds one more, viz , non-apprehension, to the list of means of right knowledge The knowledge about non-existence of an object is got through the non-apprehension Paurānikas accept Concurence (Sambhava) and Tradition (Aitihya) also as distinct means of right knowledge But the. Mīmāṁsaka rejects special status to them as distinct means of knowledge on the following grounds concurence is knowledge of a part derived from knowledge of the whole but this is merely a kind of inference [e g since there are a thousand people in the room, there are a hundred people there] Tradition is vebal testimony if it is true, and not a means at all if it is not Therefore six only are the means of right knowledge Here the Rāmāyana also supports the six fold theory of means of knowledge, thus, ' O Rāma ! in the world there are six means of knowledge by which, everything is comprehended'[3]

1 Nyāya Sangraha Vārtika (Nyāya Sāra), p, 81
2 NS, 1-1-4
3 The Rāmāyana of Vālmīki, Aranya Kānda, 52-8

PRĀBHĀKARA VIEW

It is said that a thing or principle can be established by definitions and means of right knowledge and not by a mere statement (Na hi Pratijnāmātreṇa Vastusiddhih Laksanapra-mānābhyāṁ Vastusiddhih],[1] or that the establishment of an object of knowledge depends upon the means of right knowledge [Mānādhinā meyasiddhih] Śalikanātha says that there are conflicting views among the philosophers as regards the number of means of right knowledge, etc , though the establishment of the object of knowledge through the detailed the common feature of all the systems of Indian philosophy [2]

As described above, the word, 'Pramāna' has two meanings — 1) Pramā or right knowledge and 2) Pramā-Karana or means of right knowledge The Bhāttas follow the latter meaning, i e means of right knowledge and the Prābhākaras follow the former, i e right knowledge Śālikanātha defines Pramāṇa as follows, 'experience is right knowledge and it is something different from memory' ['Anubhūtih Pramāṇam sā smrteranyā'] [3] Memory is regarded as invalid knowledge in as much as it stands in need of a previous knowledge According to the Prābhākara, it is not a necessary condition of validity of knowledge that its object should be one that is not already known

One may ask here that this definition is too comprehensive (Ativyāpta) as it includes error under knowledge The reply of the Prābhākara to this is that there is no error at all, but what passes for error as two knowledges, occuring consecutively,

1 Quoted, for example, JNMV, 1-1-2

2 स्वरूपसख्यार्थफलेषु वादिभिः यतो विवादा बहुधा वितेनिरे ।
ततो वय तत्प्रतिबोधसिद्धये प्रमाणपारायणमारभामहे ॥ PP, p, 122

3 अनुभूतिः प्रमाण सा स्मृतेरन्या स्मृतिः पुन ।
पूर्वविज्ञानसस्कारमात्रज ज्ञानमुच्यते ॥ PP, p, 127

Valid knowledge is experience, and it is something different from memory which is the name of that cognition which arises solely from the impresson left by some previous experience

neither of which is in itself erroneous Of the knowledges one is perceptual and other is recollective as in that of a piece of nacre mistaken for silver [Śūkti-rajata]. We only forget that they are two knowledges Actually speaking there is no wrong knowledge at all [1]

The controvercy centres around the question whether a right knowledge is necessarily a new piece of information The Prābhākara is emphatic in answering the question in the negative and the Bhātta in answering in the affirmative The Prābhākara contends that if a means of right knowledge is rightly employed in knowing a thing, the following knowledge must be deemed valid, irrespective of whether the features thus known in the thing are familliar to us or not, the Bhāṭṭa's answer back by arguing that a thing as associated with one moment must work different from the same thing as associated with another moment, not to take knowledge of an unfamilliar feature in a thing means not to acquire right knowledge concerning this thing

As might have become obviosus us by now, the question whether memory is a case of right knowledge The Prābhākara divides all knowledges in to those of the nature of memory and those not of the nature of memory but, unlike the Bhāṭṭa, he refuses to further subivide the non-mnetic in to right, wrong, doubt, etc, and maintained that the non-mnetic knowledge is the nature of right knowledge The number of means of right knowledge recognized by the systems of Indian philosophy as follows[2] — 1) The Materialists accept only one, viz, perception 2) The Vaiśesikas and the Buddhists accept two viz, perception, and inference 3) The Sāmkhyas accept three, viz, perception, inference and verbal testimony 4) The Naiyāyikas recognize four, viz, perception, inference, verbal testimony and analogy

1 ननु शुक्तिकाया रजतमिदमिति ज्ञान .... PP, p, 122

2 तथा सख्यायामपि । चार्वाका. प्रत्यक्षमेवैकं मन्यन्ते ।
प्रत्यक्षानुमानञ्च द्वे एव प्रमाण इति बौद्धाः वैशेषिकाश्च ....
NS on pp, 112
तत्र पञ्चविध मान प्रत्यक्षमनुमा तथा ।
शास्त्र तथोपमानार्थापत्ती इति गुरोर्मतम् ॥ PP, p, 128

5) The Bhāṭtas sanction six, viz , perception, inference, verbal testimony, analogy, presumption and non-apprehension The Paurānikas add two more to the list, viz , probability [Sambhava] and Tradition [Aitihya] The Prābhākaras, however, establish only five means of right knowledge, since they show that tradition can be included in verbal testimony, and probability in inference, and non-apprehension is superfluous

Validity of Knowledge

Here, a doubt arises whether the validity and non-validity of right and wrong knowledges are self proved (Svatah) or proved by some other means (Paratah) Mādhavācārya refers four principal views on this point, thus, "The Sānkhyas hold that both validity and non-validity are self proved , the Naiyāyikas hold that both are proved by some thing else (as inference, etc) , the Buddhists hold that the latter is self-proved and the former proved by something else , the Mīmāṁsakas maintain that validity is self proved and non-validity proved by something else"[1]

As we are mainly interested in determining validity only, the contest chiefly lies between the Mīmāṁsaka view of self-proof and the Naiyāyika view of proof by some other means

NAIYĀYIKA VIEW

The Naiyāyikas say that the validity found in the apperception [Anuvyavasāya Jñāna], first, one has the knowledge, 'This is water' Next arises the apperception 'I know this water' In this apperception, water, its genus waterness (Jala-

1 प्रमाणत्वाप्रमाणत्वे स्वतस्साख्यास्समाश्रिताः ।
नैयायिकास्ते परत· सोगताश्चरम स्वत. ॥
प्रथम परत. प्राहु प्रामाण्य वेदवादिन ।
प्रमाणत्व स्वतः प्राहुः परतश्चाप्रमाणताम् ॥
Sarva darśana sangraha, p, 279

tva) and the relation between water and i's genus -- all these three are objects, and all these are valid apprehensions Here, their validity is not apprehended by apperception Therefore, it is not self-proved but proved by other means [Paratah] For example, first one has the knowledge of water, then one goes to take that water and finds the water Here, the knowledge of water is valid because, this knowledge of water produces an action which in turn produces the fruit (of getting the water to drink etc)[1]

A negative example (vyatireka dṛstānta) for the same is . 'That which is not like this, is not like this', i e 'where there is no motivation for an action that produces a fruit, there is also no validity' In this way, the validity of the first knowledge is determined The second and third knowledges are also determined to be valid on the strength of the example of the first knowledge Thus, it is proved that the validity of knowledge is proved by inference (i e Paratah Prāmānya), a doubt arises as to what causes the production of validity in knowledge and what causes the apprehension of validity in knowledge

Here, the discussion is as to whether validity also is caused by the causal apparatus that produces knowledge (Jñānotpādaka sāmgrī) or by the apparatus other than the causal apparatus that produces knowledge Here Naiyāyikas conclude that validity of perception is born of guna In this case, the contact of the eye wite the object capable of producing valid perception is the guna If it is nonvalidity it is born of defect (Dosajanya) In inference the knowledge of Vyāpaka (which is greater in extent) as existing in a place where there is Vyāpya (which is less in extent) is the guna In analogy the knowledge of resemblance is the guna In verbal testimony the knowledge of proper competibility etc , is the guṇa Thus, the causal apparatus of the validity of a knowledge being different from the causal apparatus bringing

1 Nyāya Kandalī, 91
Nyāya Kusumānjali, p, 4-1
Nyāya siddhānta muktāvalī, p, 118
प्रमाण न स्वतो ग्राह्य सशयानुपपत्तित· ।। Kārikāvalī, 136

about a knowledge, it ought to be admitted that the production of the validity of knowledge (jñāna prāmāṇyotpatti) and the apprehension of validity (jñapti) are both caused by other sources (parataḥ).

BHĀṬṬA VIEW

Kumārila Bhaṭṭa criticizes the Naiyāyika view on the ground that it has to be admitted that the validity of knowledge is natural to that, for a capacity which is not natural to a thing cannot be produced in it by something else[1] Things certainly require a cause for their production, but once they are produced they perform their function all by themselves Here Pārthasārathi comments that a jar requires clay, etc. for its production but not for its drawing water, etc Similarly, a knowledge requires a cause for its production but it requires nothing else for its producing the function called 'ascertainment of an object'[2]

The chief objection against the Naiyāyika view is that if the validity of a knowledge is to be determined by on extra inference, the validity of that inference again will have to be ascertained by an another inference, and so on 'ad infinitum'[3] In this way there will be no certainity of knowledge For that reason, to avoid the blemish 'ad infinitum' self-validity of knowledge is to be accepted

The reason why it was pursued with so much interest by Mīmāṁsakas seems to be its important bearing on the question of the authority of the Vedas If verbal testimony was self-vaild the validity of the Vedas was self-evident, and they required no external sanction to prove their claim to unflinching obedience,

1 स्वतः सर्वप्रमाणानां प्रामाण्यमिति गम्यताम् ।
न हि स्वतोऽसती शक्तिः कर्तुमन्येन शक्यते ।।
SV, Codana, st, 47 ; NRM, p, 31, MM, p, 5

2 घटो हि मृत्पिण्डादिकं स्वजन्मन्येवापेक्षते, नोदकाहरणेऽपि तथा ज्ञानमपि
NRM, Codanā 47 ; SD, p, 97.

3 तस्यापि कारणे शुद्धे तज्ज्ञाने स्यात्प्रमाणता ।
तस्याप्येवमितीत्थं च न क्वचिद् व्यवतिष्ठते ।।
SV, Codanā, st, 51

while if verbal testimony was not self proved and proved by some other things, the Vedas required some external proof of their authority, and the Mīmāṁsakas do not admit of an author for the Vedas, hence the Veda could not be reliable.

The term, Svataḥ' means,'both the knowledge and its validity are produced by one and the same material' (svajñāna janakasāmagrītaḥ jnaptih) The Bhāṭṭas maintain that the knowledge of knowledge is always of the nature of inferential knowledge and not of mental perception. Whenever a knowledge is produced through perception or inference, then by that knowledge a particular quality, 'knownness' (jñātatā) is produced in the known objects As a result, we experience 'I have known the jar'. This knowledge appears only after the knowledge of jar Prior to the production of this quality, 'knownness', we simply know 'it is a jar' by mere perception [1]

PRĀBHĀKARA VIEW

There is no difference, between the two systems of Mīmāmsā, about the validity of knowledge but, the Prābhākara maintains that, in every knowledge, the knower, the known object, and knowledge itself, along with its validity are presented They hold that knowledge is of self-illuminous nature. As a lamp first manifests the object, then itself and finally the wick, the locus of light, the knowledge also first manifests the object, then itself and finally the soul (Ātman), the locus of knowledge Thus all perceptions include the object, the knowledge and the knower, the soul It is known technically as 'tripuṭī-pratyakṣa'[2]

A comparative study of the Bhāṭṭa system and the Prābhākara system reveals the fact that both these systems have the following common points of agreement :— 1) No extra material is required in determining the validity. 2) The knowledge of the objects do not depend on the consciousness of after cognition, in which the subject is also presented [Anuvyavasāya] for its own manifestation 3) All kinds of knowledge are

1 'Validity of knowledge in Indian Logic', Dr. Rāghavan Felcitation Volume, p, 182.

2 Bṛhatī, p, 48

always tripartite cognition [Triputi gocara] It would not be correct to say that only the knowledge 'I know the book' is tripartite perception because even in the knowledge, 'It is a book' we experience that this type of knowledge also includes the book, its form and its locus, the soul It is in the fitness of the argument that this very knowledge also manifests the validity, and that the knowledge of book do not depend on any other extra material for its validity.

It may be observed here that it is only on the third point that the Bhāṭṭa differs from the Prābhākara because according to the Bhāṭṭa the knowledge being tripartite cognition could not become the cause of its own manifestation This point of the Prābhākara appears to the Bhāṭṭa as a self contradictory one on the simple ground that the subject is always different from the object. The subject and the object are never identical To admit knowledge as subject as well as object of manifestation would involve self-contradiction

ERROR

The Mīmāṁsaka, like the Naiyāyi ka, declares that the invalidity of knowledge derives extrinsically [parataḥ] on the simple ground that wrong knowledge alway sdependes on visual defect The vision of rope-snake [rajju sarpabhrānti] is just due to the lack of proper contact between eye and rope This illusion, technically, called as Khyāti or error All the systems of Indian philosophy have their own theories of error They are[1]— 1) self apprehension [Ātmakhyāti] of the Idealist Buddhists [Yogācāra or Vijnānavāda Bauddhas], 2) apprehension of non being [Asat khyāti] of the Nihilist Buddhists [Mādhyamika or Śūnyavāda Bauddhas], 3) non-apprehension [Akhyāti] of the Prābhākaras, 4) misapprehension [Anyathā khyāti] of the Naiyāyikas, 5) apprehension of indefinible [Anirvacanīya-

1 आत्मख्यातिरसत्ख्यातिरख्याति ख्यातिरन्यथा । VV, p, 24
SV, Nirālamba, st, 117

khyāti] of Advaita Vedāntins and 6) misapprehension [Viparīta khyāti] of the Bhāttas

The Idealist says that the object that is presented in an error is wholly mental, which is wrongly projected as something external. That is, in the rope-snake illusion, it is mental idea of snake that comes out and manifests as an external object after being superimposed on the rope Thus, according to him, in an illusion, a subjective idea is cognized as an external object They say that actually there are no external objects but only ideas [vijñānas] Erroneous knowledge consistes in the self or consciousness externalizing itself in the form of objects, such as the snake in the current example

This theory was refuted by pointing out that the sublating knowledge, 'this is not silver' [nedam rajatam], does not sublate the externality of the object of erroneous knowledge, nor does it establish the internality thereof[1]

The Nihilist says that the object that is presented in an illusion is wholly non-existent (Asat) i e in an illusion, a non-existent thing, say snake in the rope-snake illusion, is known as existent According to him, error consists in the knowledge of a non-being as a being In the example where the rope is cognized as snake, the person concerned knows snake, which is a non-being, as a being Had the snake been a being the knowledge would not be an illusion. The Mīmāmsaka criticizes it by asking how a non-being, which is of the character of the void, and is therefore devoid of all types of distinguishing characteristics, can ever be apprehended Even if it be admitted that the knowledge of non-being is possible, then this theory does not differ essentially from the theory of misapprehension of the Mīmāmsaka

The Nihilist, further, on the analogy of dream knowledge, argues that, just as in the dream state, in instances of illusion arising during the waking state too, knowledge of object which is non-existent is possible The objection of the Bhātta against to the view is that the Nihilist fails to note the real

1 VV, pp, 152-154

character of the knowledge which cognizes objects in the dream state What actually happens in a dream is that, due to several reasons, a series of past impressions lying dormant up to then become activized and give rise to the knowledge of dream objects Hence the theory of apprehension of non-being cannot be established on the analogy of dream knowledges [1]

The Prābhākara holds that there is no illusory knowledge at all, and that which is called an illusory knowledge is made up of two elements, an experience and a recollection When we know rope as snake we actually cognize only the qualities common to rope and snake The qualities common to rope and snake revive the idea of snake in our mind by association Here one is perception i e seeing the rope, and another is recollection i.e remembering the snake One of these two knowledges, recollection, is mistaken for perception It is this non-apprehension of difference [bhedāgraha] that leads to illusory knowledge[2]

Here, the Bhāṭṭa argues against the theory of non-apprehension that why a person does fear while seeing the thing lying before him, if he does not take it as snake. The volitional decision could not be said to have been caused by the recollection of snake, as only the presence of the object itself, and not the recollection of it, can produce the activity, and snake is not present here Hence the two in one theory cannot be established

The Naivāyika view of error is what is called misapprehension or Anyathākhyāti, according to which, the error consists in taking one thing for another That is, the object appears as 'otherwise [anyathā]' as some thing other than what it is In the rope-snake illusion, for instance, rope is apprehended as otherwise i.e , as snake which exists in some other place Thus, according to this view, illusion consists in perceiving snake not where it really is, but in the object rope

1 ibid, pp 119–144

2 अनन्तरञ्च रजते स्मृतिजाता तथापि च।
मनो दोषात्तदित्यंशपरामर्शविवर्जितम् ॥
रजत विषयीकृत्य नैव शुक्तिर्विवेचितम् ।
स्मृत्याऽतो रजताभास उपपन्नो भविष्यति ॥ PP, p 50

The Naiyāyika's contention is that at the time of illusory perception one perceives the snake that is else where through a super-normal sense contact [jñāna-lakṣaṇa-pratyāsatti] There is almost complete agreement between the Naiyāyika and the Bhāṭṭa regarding the explanation of error But only the difference lies in the sense contact. The Naiyāyika interposes a super-normal sense contact between the visual organ and the real snake But the Bhāṭṭa accepting the relation as given considers the relation as non-existent If the word 'anyathā' means 'other than what it is' 'Viparīta' means 'contrary to what it is'

The Advaita philosopher says that in the current example, the illusory snake is a entirely new creation by Māyā with its two powers of projection and screening. Māyā screens the real nature of the 'this' also creates in its place a snake anew which the percipient observes It [snake] comes into existence with the perception and goes out of existence with the cessation of perception Thus, the snake is an entirely new creation for the time being, on the rope, by Māyā. The illusory snake is neither a positive (sat) nor a negative entity (asat) It cannot be an absolute reality as it gets sublated For, absolute reality can never be sublated It cannot be absolute void, because it is perceived As the illusory snake does not admit of being definitely described as real or void, it should be called, hence, indefinable [anirvacanīya][1]

This theory also does not differ much from the theory of misapprehension and in the case of delusion caused by the presence of an external adjunct [sopādhika-bhrama], the Advaitin also follows only the theory of misapprehension The delusion may be explained thus a man suffering from jaundice mistakes a white conch to be yellow Here yellowness belongs to the bile and not to the conch But the yellowness of the bile comes to be erroneously referred to the conch That is, the illusion is possible here because of confusion between conch and the bile Thus, illusion consists in the cognition of one thing as another thing This is nothing but the theory of misapprehension Hence it is clear that in the case of delusion caused by the pre-

1 Bhāmatī, 1 1-4.

sence of an external adjunct, the Advaitin follows only the theory of misapprehension.

The Bhāṭṭa theory of error is known as misapprehension [viparita-khyāti] According to it, in error, one cognizes a real object in the form of a different object which too is real The contents of our knowledge as a complex may be false, but the several things we apprehend are true Illusion creeps in during the synthetic activity of the mind In the example of the rope-snake when the rope is seen as snake the erroneous knowledge that arises takes the form, 'this is a snake' Here 'this' stands for the rope lying in front of the person, and it is first seen as something yonder lying and not as rope, the distinctive feature of rope being missed through some defect in sight The visual perception of rope arises in the ordinary way, throughthe normal sense contact, between the sense organ and the object seen. The 'snakeness', which belongs to the real snake else where, is presented here as the attribute of the rope seen as 'this'. It is therefore seen that the relation alone is false, the ontological status of both the subject and the predicate remaining unaltered[1]

PRĀBHĀKARA VIEW

The Prābhākara rejects the theory of misapprehension on the ground that if the possibility of a knowledge deviating from the true form of its object is once accepted, one would have to accept the possibility that all direct knowledge involves doubt as to its validity In other words, even after perceiving an object, say for example, a jar,one would doubt whether it is really a jar , for what guarantee is there that, as in the case of the rope, here also the knowledge has not deviated from the true form of its object And if the theory of misapprehension is accepted, it would amount to accepting the proposition that in a case of illusion the knowledge reflects some thing other than the thing lying in front, in which case the knowledge will have no object to rest upon

Prabhākara describes the process of error as follows, "when a knowledge has for its object some thing which is similar to

1 SV, p. 245, st. 117 and p. 312, st. 160 (Com)

another thing and when it fails to take note of the former thing's features that distinguish it from the latter, this knowledge generates memory of this latter thing in the person who is, however, ignorant of the fact that he is having a piece of memory. Thus are explained the knowledges like that of nacre as silver"[1] One may rise an objection against the view that if an object must have such a nature as is revealed in a knowledge concerning itself there can be no wrong knowledges, while if there can be wrong knowledges an object need not have such a nature as is revealed in a knowledge concerning itself The reply of the Prābhākara is that when there arises concerning rope that is similar to snake a knowledge which, on account of defective sense organs, fails to take note of such features of the rope as are no doubt present there and distinguish it from snake, while taking note of only such of its features as are common to it and snake this knowledge gives rise to memory. On account of defect the knower does not have introspection with snake to the effect that he is having a memory

That is why he makes no difference between the perceived thing and the recollected thing Thus, as a matter of fact, here there take place two knowledges, viz , perception of 'it' and memory of snake, for otherwise it is impossible to say how the knowledge of snake, comes about in this case Definitely, the knowledge of snake is not product of sense organs, for snake has not here come in contact with sense organs It is a rule that sense organs do not produce knowledge concerning an object which has not come in contact with there, e g , a blind person has no visual knowledges Hence the concerned knowledge of snake is a case of memory This is how the knowledges like that of rope as snake are explained as case of memory[2]

1 विषयान्तरसदृशमालम्ब्य अगृहीतविवेक यद्ज्ञानमुत्पन्न तत्सदृशविषयान्तरे स्मृतिहेतुता प्रतिपद्यते स्मरामीति ज्ञानशून्यस्य । उपपन्नानि तावत् शुक्तिषु रजतादिज्ञानानि .... Bṛhati, pp. 50-51

2 .... विज्ञानद्वयं चैतत्, इदमिति प्रत्यक्षमिति ... । न हि तदिन्द्रियजम्, तेन सम्प्रयोगाभावात् । असयुक्ते चेन्द्रिय विज्ञान न जनयति, अन्धस्यानुत्पादात् । स्मरणमेवेदम् । Ṛjuvimalā, pp 50-51

The theory of non-apprehension of the Prābhākara holds a good psychological analysis of illusion In the sentences of D. Venkataramaiah[1], it has this advantage over the theory of misapprehension of the Bhāṭṭas in that it is true to the realism of the Mīmāṁsakas. While the Bhāṭṭas have to account for error by positing a relation [saṁsarga] which is non est and as such is subjective and so prove disloyal to their realistic postulate, the Prābhākaras, by cancelling error altogether and ascribing validity to all experience, can maintain their adherence to realism unimpaired.

The theory of non-apprehension of the Prābhākara seems to be an improvement upon the theory of apprehension of non-being of the Nihilist and the theory of self apprehension of the Idealist in this, that erroneous perception, according to it, does not, as it does in the view of Nihilist, lose its cognitive character altogether, nor is it reduced, as the Idealist reduces it, to a process of inner apprehension or introspection So it is, in a sense, more satisfactory than the other two from the pyschological point of view

But according to this theory, there cannot be any verbal experience from the Vedic sentences which can deny the objects learnt already from the other sentences because, in that case, it will prove that the experience obtained from the first sentence as invalid And this is against the Bhāṣyakāra on this point [2]

1 D. Venkataramaiah's Eng. Translation of Sāstra Dīpikā, Intro, p. XIV.

2 There are two kinds of such Vedic sentences In both cases, the sentence that comes later contradicts the objects learned from the earlier one These are called Prāptabādha and Aprāptabādha sentences Prabhākara has to explain these two Bādhas which seen to militate against his Akhyātivāda.

Śabarasvāmin is quite clear on this point. He urged that a certain thing experienced in one form from an earlier sentence in the Vedas is nullified by the experi-

continued in next page

PERCEPTION

All the systems of Indian philosophy accept that Pratyakṣa [perception] is the chief among the means of knowledge because, Inference and other means of knowledge depend on perception for their data, while perception is immediate and direct

Preception is essentially a sensory knowledge arising from the contact of sense organs with the object Inference, though obtained through sense organs, is different from perception as it gives the knowledge of distant objects indirectly Similarly the remaining means of right knowledge Perception being sensuous is evidenced by experience and convention For, e g if one sees through visual organ or smells through olfactory

ence of a sentence occurring later, and thus Bādha takes place. This is called Prāptabādha Here also Prabhākara wants to show that Śabara's words favour his own theory, and comments on the statements of the Bhāṣya stated above accordingly He pleads that in the case of so called Prāptabādhas where the performance of certain actions is denied later at the time when it is to be performed, there is no real denial of actions learnt from the previous sentences and are brought down for performance. The rites that are once recommended as Angas for execution in the Vikṛtiyāgas, are always considered as Angas with reference to those Vikṛtis but their denial later means they are not needed in the performance of the Vikṛtiyāga as they are displaced by other Aṅgas. The term Bādha is used in this connection, because the Aṅgas considered as unnecessary are not performed and as a matter of fact, there is no denial of anything known already. This view of Prabhākara has been criticised by Pārthasārathi, and he had shown how this theory of Prabhākara militates against the unequivocal statements of Śabarasvāmin on this point.

K. S. Rāmasvāmi Śāstri, NRM, Intro, p. L.

organ, etc , one has the knowledge of colour or smell, etc Thus it is an experience, which is actual, resulting from the contact of sense organs with the objects

The etymology of Pratyakṣa in the sense of means of knowledge is explained as Pratigataṁ aksaṁ or Aksasya prati viṣayam vrttih, the presence of a sense organ at each object In the sense of knowledge, the same word is explained as Akṣaṁ akṣam pratitya utpadyate or pratigatam āśritam akṣam, knowledge which is obtained through each sense organ The perception knowledge is defined as that knowledge which is produced by the contact of sense organs with external objects

The revered Jaimini defines perception as follows "Perception is a knowledge which appears in a person when there is contact of the sense organ with the object " (Satsamprayoge puruṣasyendriyāṇām buddhi-janmā tat pratyakṣam)[1] Thinking that the definition is fallacious, the commentator Upavarsa interchanged the positions of the words, 'Sat and Tat' in the definition and reframed the same as follows · " True perception is that which arises from the contact of a person's sense organ with that object alone of which it is the perception" (Tat samprayoge purusasyendriyāṇām buddhi janmā tatpratyaksam) It manifests the object actually present , it cannot manifest the past, future, subtle, mediate and remote objects

Śabarasvamin observes, in this connection, that knowledge (of an object) arises first but is not known (object) first It happens sometimes that even a known object is described as not known (referring to the past, for instance). Also, the form of knowledge is not apprehended without being denoted by the object But, the knowledge as such can never be the object of perception If the knowledge and the object were to be same, it is the knowledge that has to be denied an existence and not the object The two are not identical in form As a matter of fact, we infer knowledge without form (i e. as of a particular thing), and perceive the object with form

It is only with this intention that the Naiyāyikas not only

1 JS, 1-1-4.

enumerate the six types of perception but also six fold sense-object contact He also specifies the defects of the sense organs. They are · non contact of the sense organ with the mind, and affections of the sense organs such as jaundice, etc The defects of the mind attachment, hatred, etc That is right knowledge, in which are the mind, the sense organ and the object do not suffer from any kind of defects

BHĀṬṬA VIEW

Almost all the philosophers indisputably accept the process of perception as described by Vātsāyana, 'The soul is united with the mind, the mind with the sense organ and this with the object. As a result of this action of contacts, perceptual knowledge is produced in the soul' [Ātmā manasā saṁyujyate mana indriyena Indriyaṁ arthena, tatah pratyaksam][1] Following this process Pārthasārathi defines perception as follows, 'The knowledge that arises when there is sense-object contact is perception' [Indriyārtha samprayogajam jñānam pratyakṣam][2] It is essentially a sensory knowledge arising from the contact of the sense organ with the object E g if one sees through eyes or smells through nose, etc , one has the knowledge of colour or smell

Pārthasārathi defines sense-organ as follows · ' Sense organ is that which generates a vivid and specific knowledge of the object with which it comes in contact ' [yat samprayukterthe viśadāvabhāsam vijñānaṁ janayati tad indriyam ucyate'][3] It is an integral part of the body This means that it acts in conformity with the body. That is, if favoured by the body (if the body is in good condition) it favours , if injured, it does not work. Sense organs bring pleasure or pain to the soul by comprehending the objects These are six, viz visual (cakṣus), auditory (Śrotra), olfactory (ghrāṇa), gustatory (jihvā) tactual (tvak) and, mind (manaḥ). Among these, mind is the internal and the rest are external The external organs are also different

1 Vātsāyana on GS, 1-1-4
2 SD, p. 34
3 ibid, p. 36

from one another by nature, location and function The external organs are elemental, i e of the nature of elements The olfactory sense organ is earthy, the gustatory sense organ is watery, the visual sense organ is of the nature of light, the tactual sense organ is space Here the Naiyāyikas say that the auditory sense organ is of the nature of ether Even the Neo-Bhaṭṭas also follow the view Hence Nārāyana says as follows — What is called the visual sense organ is the light existing within the pupil of the eye, then the water element at the tip of the tongue is the gustatory sense organ, the earth particle within the nose is the olfactory sense organ, the air particles distributed throughout the skin are what is called the tactual sense organ, the auditory sense organ is only ether within the ear, the mind, however, is all-pervasive, and it produces its effect in the body "[1]

Kumārila holds that the auditory sense organ is not of the nature of ether but, of space because the Veda says, 'the auditory sense organ is from space [diśaḥ śrotram] He says that if it is absolutely necessary to deny the assertion of the Naiyāyikās, then we must seek to establish the fact of space being the sense of audition on the ground of its being laid down in the Veda [2]

In respect of the elemental nature of the sense organs the Bhaṭṭās use the arguments :— for the perception of colour, the visual sense organ made of light element must be the cause because the light is also found to manifest colour, for the perception of taste, the gustatory sense organ made of water element must be the cause because the water element is also found to manifest taste, for the perception of smell, the olfactory sense organ made of earth element must

1 चक्षुर्नाम कनीनिकान्तरगतं तेजोऽथ जिह्वाग्रग-
स्तोयांशो रसन क्षितेरवयवो घ्राण च घोणोदरे ।
सर्वाङ्गप्रसृताश्च मारुतलवास्त्वङ्नाम कर्णोदर
व्योमैव श्रवण मनस्तु विभु तद्देहे च कार्यावहम् ॥ MM, p 10

2 दिग्भागे तु समस्तोऽसावागमात्तु विशिष्यते ॥
SV, Śabda nityatā, st 150

be the cause because the earth element is also found to manifest smell, e g when the paste of margosa bark [nimba-tvak] is applied to sandal, the smell of the sandal is manifested, for the perception of touch, the tactual sense organ made of air particles must be the cause because the air particles are also found to manifest touch By the process of elimination the auditory sense organ is established to be of the nature of ether by the Naiyāyikās, but the Bhattas establish it to be of the nature of space, on the authority of scriptures

Mind, which is an internal sense organ, is ubiquitous [vibhu] and is in eternal contact with the soul, that soul and mind, in contact with each other, function only within the sphere of the body with which they happen to be associated ' and that our experience is inconclusive and cannot be said to be such as would rule out the possibility of several knowledges arising at the same time Contact is that relation between the sense organ and the object which leads to perception This is established on the ground that remote objects are not known The contact is actual in the case of touch and taste It is of three kinds — conjunction [saṁyoga], identity-with-what is conjoired [san yi k a-tādātmya] and identity-wi h-what is identical-with-what is conjoined [saṁyukta-tādātmya-tādātmya], The perception of substance is due to the contact of conjunction, of colour, taste, smell touch etc, due to the contact of identity-with-what is conjoined, and of colourness, tasteness smellness, touchness, etc, due to the contact of identity-with-what-is identical-with-what is conjoined

Naiyāyikās accept that the contact is sixfold — conjunction [samyoga], inherence-in- what-is conjoined [samyukta-samavāya], inherence in-what-is-inherent-in-what- is conjoined [samyukta samaveta-samavāya], inherence [samavāya], inherence--in--what-is-inherent [samaveta-samavāya] and the contact of the qualifier and the qualified [viśeṣana-viśesya-bhāva] The contact of the visual sense organ with objects like the pot, etc, is example for the first The visual sense organ and mind have the contact of the second, when they perecive the qualities, movements, and genus of objects. The contact between the respective sense organs and the genus abiding in the qualities

and actions of substances is the third The contact of the auditory sense organ with sound is inherence ,and that of the same with the genus 'soundness' is the fifth In perceiving non-existence, the contact beween the non-existence and the sense organ is the contact of the qualifier and the qualified

According to the Bhāttas sound is not the quality of the ether, but an individual substance, hence there is no necessity to accept inherence (the fourth) sense contact to perceive sound, because the contact between the sense organ and the substance is conjunction only Like wise, the contact between the sense organ and soundness is identity-with-what-is conjoined (second one) only, hence there is no necessity to accept the contact of inherence in-what-is-inherent (fifth one) Non-existence is known by non-apprehension (anupalabdhi), therefore, there is no necessity to accept the contact of the qualifier and the qualified (sixth one) Therefore, contacts are only of three kinds The first three kinds of the contact of the Naiyāyikas and those of the Bhāṭtas differ only in terminology If the Naiyāyikas call it inherence, the Bhāttas call it identity Here the word 'identity' [tādātmya] is substituted for the word 'inherence' [samavāya] The reason is that inherence as a form of relation, subsisting between two naturally inseparable things, is rejected by the Bhāttas.

The Naiyāyikas divide perceptual knowledge into two kinds, viz , the ordinary and the extra-ordinary , and accept three types of extra-ordinary sense contacts to perceive the extra ordinary perceptional knowledges These are — 1) contact through generality [sāmānya-laksana-pratyāsatti], 2) contact through association [jñāna-laksana-pratyāsatti] and 3) contact through meditation [yoga-laksana-pratyāsatti] [1]

In the perception of all individuals possessing a generic-nature, the knowledge of the generic nature constitutes the contact This is a transcendent contact whose character is general, when, for instance, there arises in us a perception of smoke of all times and all places The process by which this perception takes place is as follows — The contact between

1 अलौकिकस्तु व्यापार त्रिविध· परिकीर्तित । BP, st 63

our visual sense organ and the particular case of smoke is an ordinary one called conjunction and that between our visual sense organ and the smokeness is also an ordinary one which is called inherence-with-what-is conjoined But the contact between our visual sense organ and all cases of smoke is not an ordinary one It is a transcendent contact, as there is no ordinary conjunction of our visual sense organ with all cases of smoke of all times and all places The contact consists here of the knowledge of smokeness a generic nature which is possessed by all cases of smoke of all times and all places This sort of contact is called the contact through generality

The second (contact through association) is that in which one perception gives rise to another-- as when one perceives a piece of sandal wood at a distance and at once knows that it is fragrant Here, the fragrance is not perceived by any sense organ, because the object was at a distance It is therefore apprehended by a kind of extra-ordinary contact The third (contact through meditation) belongs exclusively to sages who, by means of their super-human powers, can perceive objects imperceptible to others

The Bhāṭṭas do not accept the extra-ordinary perception and for that purpose extra-ordinary contacts too Their argument is that the universal judgement relating to smokes and fires in general terms are the result of the synthesis which a thinker's mind is capable of making In cases like the visual perception of sandal wood as fragrant, one may see easily a jumble of visual perception of sandal wood and recollection of fragrance through association of ideas Even in the case of contact through meditation Kumārila says thus "we never find if any person has ever improved his vision to such an extent that he could perceive sound through vision Perception is restricted only to objects existing at present At present we do not find any omniscient person and there is no proof that such a person ever existed[1]

1 न लोकव्यतिरिक्त हि प्रत्यक्षं योगिनामपि ॥
प्रत्यक्षत्वेन तस्यापि विद्यमानोपलम्भनम् । SV, pratyakṣa, st 28-29

Perception is of two kinds, viz, indeterminate (nirvikalpaka) and determinate (savikalpaka) When the mind comes into contact with an external object, only a skelital knowledge is produced through the sense organs at the first moment and the particular features of the object are not noticed. Indeterminate perception is a knowledge which does not involve any attribute or adjunct [1] It resembles the perception of infants, dumb persons and animals The Grammarians do not accept the indeterminate perception because, according to the Grammarians, there is no knowledge without denotation by a word. Bhartṛhari says, thus —

> " There is no knowledge in the world
> which is not accompanied by words "[2]

Against the Grammarian's view Kumārila argues that the denial of indeterminate perception is against the wellestablished fact because, experience proves that on the contact of a sense organ with an object the knowledge that arises in the first place is indeterminate perception [3] The indeterminate perception consists in the direct and simple awareness of an individual object [vyakti] and its generic attribute [jāti] which arises immediately after the sense organ comes into contact with them, and that it misses the definite feature of the genus as being common to several individuals belonging to a particular class and the specific character of the individual as being different from others [i e the element of continuance [anuvrtti] in the latter case] Kumārila, in his description of it, compares it to the unverbalised dumb experience of a child or of a dumb person

After the indeterminate perception, through the exercise of mental analysis, the object is perceived as possessing a definite nature, form, etc Determinate perception is a knowledge which involves an attribute or adjunct The Buddhists do

1 अस्ति ह्यालोचनाज्ञान पथम निर्विकल्पकम् ।
बालमूकादिविज्ञानसदृश शुद्धवस्तुजम् ॥ SV, Pratyakṣa, st 112

2 न सोऽस्ति प्रत्ययो लोके यश्शब्दानुगमादृते । Vākyapadiya, 3

3 SV, p. 161

not accept determinate perception and consider all determinate perceptions are erroneous But the Buddhists view is also against the well - settled fact because, expereince proves that a class character also is an object of perception [1]

The determinate perception appears in five ways with the attributes of genus [jāti], substance [dravya], quality [guna], action [kriyā] and name [nāma],[2] e g he is a cowherd, he with the flute, he is blue, he sings, he is Govinda Some people accept recognition as the sixth kind of determinate perception Their argument is that even animals on the very day of their birth first become aware of their mother, the next moment they have the knowledge 'This is that' and so without the necessity of any word-relation are capable of recognition Hence recognition is the sixth kind of determinate perception Against this view Pārthasārathi argues that the recognition undercomes in the fifth kind i e name only Hence determinate perception appears in five ways only

The determinate perception, on the other hand, gives the object with each of its explicated particulars such as the genus etc , [viz the individual, the relation between generic attribute and individual and so on] The argument of the Mīmāmsakas is that though at the first instant non-determinate perception gives only the vague inclusive whole it should also possess the rudiments of determinate perception to account for their manifestation when the object is closely perceived

PRĀBHĀKARA VIEW

The Prābhākaras, who are the upholders of the doctrine of tripartite perception or triple knowledge give another definition on the ground that the Bhāṭṭa definition of perception is less extensive Śālikanātha defines perception as follows,

> 'Direct apprehension is perception'
> [Sākṣāt pratītih pratyakṣam][3] ;

1 SD, p. 38
2 ibid p. 41
3 साक्षात्प्रतीतिः प्रत्यक्षा मेयमातृप्रमासु सा ।
मेयेष्विन्द्रिययोगोत्था द्रव्यजातिगुणेषु सा ॥ PP, p. 146

According to the Prābhākaras, even recollection, inference and such other knowledges, usually considered non-perceptional in their character, are really perceptional on the subjective side, in so far as they themselves and the knower are concerned, though they are non-perceptional on the objective side, in so far as their objects are concerned

In a perception, the cognized object is cloth, etc , the cognizer is the self and the cognition is the experience of the object as it is cognition of these three is tripartite perception But the Bhāttas say that the self, generally, is the constant conscious, substratum , and the self is not only the apprehender always That is, the knowership is not universal because in the ex , ' I know myself ' and such the self is the objectalso. But the Prābhākaras do not accept the view that the soul is the object of mental perception

Direct cognition envisaging the apprehended object proceeds directly from sense contact [sannikarsa] The six sense organs are well known Among these, the mind is the internal and the rest are external The Prābhākaras say, like the Bhāttas, that the external organs are elemental— the visual sense organ is of the nature of light, the auditory sense organ is ether bound by the orifice of the ear, the olfactory sense organ is earthy, the gustatory sense organ is watery, and the tactual sense organ is aerial Here, we have to notice that the Bhāṭtas hold that the auditory sense organ is of the space but, the Prābhākaras, like the Naiyāyikas, hold that the auditory sense organ is of the nature of ether only [1] In respect of other sense organs, both the schools use the same arguements to show their elemental nature [2]

According to the Prābhākaras, the sense contact is three fold , conjunction [samyoga], (2) inherence-in-what-is-conjoined [samyukta-samavāya] and, (3) inherence [samavāya] The perception of substance is through the contact of conjunction , of colour, taste, smell, etc , is through the contact of inherence

1 ibid p 150
2 supra p. 22

in-what--is-conjoined, sound is through the contact of inherence Sound is the quality of ether in this school Non-existence, colourness, and soundness, etc, are not existing according the Prābhākaras, hence other sense contacts are superfluous, The tactual, gustatory and olfactory sense organs cause perception only when they come in actual contact with the objects However, the reaching out to the objects [prāpyakāritva] in case of visual and auditory sense organs is proved by inference The Prābhākaras, like the Naiyāyikas, accept mind is an eternal atomic substance

The Prābhākaras, like the Bhāṭṭas, unlike the Naiyāyikas, do not accept the extra ordinary perceptions and the extra-ordinary sense contacts In respect of the indeterminate and the determinate perceptions, however, there is no difference between the Bhāṭṭa and the Prābhākara schools, but regarding the indeterminate perception, the Prābhākaras maintain that every knowledge, however, indeterminate it may be, involves a substantive, an attribute and their relation, that both generic attribute [jāti] and the individuality [vyaktitva] are presented in the indeterminate along with difference in the form of the individual object; and that, at the stage of the indeterminate, the knower does not realize that the generic attribute presented in his knowledge is common to all the individuals belonging to the same class and that these individuals are of different classes, and he is not, therefore, in a position to articulate his indeterminate perception, through verbal expression

In this connection, a word may be said about the doctrine of tripartite perception or triple knowledge — perceptual knowledge includes at once the three, viz, the knowledge, the known, and the knower In every act of knowledge, the self, object and the knowledge are revealed— knowledge, which is self-luminous, manifests both the self and the object.

INFERENCE

Anumāna (inference) etymologically means 'after knowledge' It is 'after knowledge' in the sense that the data for inference are derived from either perception or verbal testimony and help the mind to proceed on further and add to its knowledge All the systems of Indian philosophy (except the Cārvāka) are based on inference and no other means of right knowledge has been more so elaborately discussed in epistemology as inference It may well be contended that, in the perception of a composite structure like a tree, only certain parts of the tree come in contact with the eye and several parts do not, infact, come into direct relation with the sense organ, and that in such cases, the experience of the whole of which, we become known, must be taken as inference

Śabarasvāmin defines inference as follows, 'Inference is knowledge arising in a person who is knower of the concomitant relation (between probans and probandum), and who perceives one of these, (viz , probans) that is in relation to the other (viz , probandum) which is not in immediate contact (with the sense organs)' (Anumānam jñāta-sambandhasya ekadeśa-darśanād ekadeśāntare asannikrste arthe buddhih)

Further, he divides inference into the two types :— 1) inference based upon the directly perceived relationship (pratyaksato drsta) , e g , the inference of fire following from the knowledge of smoke (which is based upon the invariable concomitance of smoke and fire, which has been directly perceived in the kitchen) , 2) inference based upon a generalised relationship (sāmānyato drsta) , e g , the inference of Sun's movement following from the knowledge of change of his position When we see that Devadatta moves from one place and reaches another, we suppose that all movements lead to some destination— Wherever there is movement there is change of position as in Devadatta— on the basis of this invariable concomitance we infer that the Sun moves from one place to another since his presence is seen in different places [1]

1 तत्तु द्विविधम्-प्रत्यक्षतो दृष्टसम्बन्ध सामान्यतो दृष्टसम्बन्धञ्च ।

continued in next page

BHĀTTA VIEW

Kumārila Bhatta, commenting the definition of Bhāṣyakāra, explains three meanings for the compound 'jñata-sambandha-sya' as follows — 1) jñatah sambandhah yena— the cogniser who has already experienced the relation— the invariable concomitance (vyāpti) of the probans and the probandum, both of which are conveyed by the word 'Ekadeśa' in the definition, or 2) jñātah sambandhah yasmin—the subject, in which the same relation between them (the probans and the probandum) might have been experienced, or 3) jñatah sambandhah yayon — both the probans and the probandum, the mutual relation of which is already known[1] The word 'Ekadeśa' in the definition would mean the probans

The word 'sambandha' in the definition is explained thus— the invariable concomitance of the probans and the probandum When the relation is thus spoken of, the related objects are also spoken of as the pervaded (vyāpya) — the probans and the pervader (vyāpaka)— the probandum The pervaded is one which exists either in all the cases of the pervader or in some only, while the pervader exists in all the cases of the pervaded[2] Of the two, the pervaded is the probans— the chief means of inferential knowledge, and the pervader is the probandum— the object inferred[3]

तत्र प्रत्यक्षतो दृष्टसम्बन्ध यथा– धूमाकृतिदर्शनादग्न्याकृतिविज्ञानम् ।
सामान्यतो दृष्टसम्बन्ध यथा– देवदत्तस्य गतिपूर्विका देशान्तरप्राप्ति-
मुपलभ्यादित्येऽपि गतिस्मरणम् । SBh, p 32

1 प्रमाता ज्ञातसम्बन्ध एकदेश्यथवोच्यते ।
कर्मधारयपक्षे वा सम्बन्धिन्येकदेशता ॥
द्वय वा ज्ञातसम्बन्धमुपलब्ध परस्परम् ।
तस्यैकदेशशब्दाभ्यामुच्येते समुदायिनौ ॥ SV, Anumana, st, 3-4

2 व्याप्यस्य गमकत्व च व्यापक गम्यमिष्यते ।
यो यस्य देशकालाभ्या समो न्यूनोऽपि वा भवेत् ।
ibid, Anumāna, st 5

3 व्याप्यांशो व्यापकांशस्य तथैव प्रतिपादक ।
ibid, Anumāna, st. 11

Pārthasārathi explains Śabara's definition as follows — When a person after perceiving, as unfailing, in that which serves as an example the association of particular some thing (probans, say smoke) with another particular some thing (probandum, say fire) this association being either direct or indirect[1] and anyone of the following kinds— conjunction (saṃyoga), inherence (samavāya), inherence-in-a-common substrate (ekārtha samavāya), cause and effect (kāryakāraṇatva) or other, should perceive that particular something (probans) in that which holds the probandum (viz, the subject, hill) there arises in him the knowledge of the other (viz, probandum, fire) which is one of the two objects related in the manner aforesaid, presuming however that it is not already known through a means of knowledge, that knowledge is inference'[2]

The presence of the probans in the subject is usually a judgement of perception— smoke is perceived on the hill and fire is inferred But the inference takes place only when the universal relation between smoke and fire is already known This relation called as invariable concomitance (vyāpti) The knowledge of invariable concomitance is the result of the experiences of the co-existence of the probans and the probandum in many instances in different times and places It is possible to experience the invariable concomitance of two properties of a general character (sāmānya-dharma) or between two concrete objects The experience of the invariable concomitance between the genus of smoke and the genus of fire is that between two general properties[3], while the experience of the invariable

1 Of the relations between the probans and the probandum, conjunction and inherence are direct relations, where as the relation of inherence in a common substrate and the relation of cause and effect are indirect relations. SD (Tr), p 77, f

2 यस्य यादृशस्य येन यादृशेन साक्षाद्वा प्रणाड्या वा यादृशस्सबन्ध SD, p 60

भूयोदर्शनगम्या च व्याप्ति सामान्यधर्मयो ॥
ज्ञायते भेदहानेन क्वचिच्चापि विशेषयो. ।
कृत्तिकोदयमालक्ष्य रोहिण्यासत्तिक्लृप्तिवत् ॥ ibid, Anu, st 12-13

concomitance between the rise of Kṛttikā in the horizon and that of Rohiṇī in succession to it is that between two concrete instances

Invariable concomitance is natural relation[1] And naturalness is freedom from extraneous adjuncts (upādhis) An extraneous adjunct is that which constantly accompanies the probandum, but does not always accompany the probans, e g "Mitra has many sons of whom one is black, and he rest fair complexioned The son conceived at a time when Mitrā ate vegetables, is black, but other sons that were conceived while she did not eat vegetables but drank milk, are fair-complexioned " Here we find that 'eating vegetable' is an extraneous adjunct which accompanies Mitrā's black son, but does not accompany her fair-complexioned sons An extraneous adjunct is not in itself a defect, but its attachment to the probans indicates that that term is erratic and the conclusion drawn therefrom wrong.

The invariable concomitance has to be ascertained carefully Repeated observation will give the concomitance and counter argument will remove doubts regarding extraneous adjuncts e g An individual sees smoke and fire together in a kitchen and begins to think as follows ·— 'Are smoke and fire together only in the kitchen or do they exist together in all places at all times ? Does either of them exist without the other ?' , He repeatedly observes that wherever there is smoke there is fire He also observes the non-existence of smoke, and in certain places, the existence of fire without smoke The investigator then questions as follows :— 'Is there any extraneous adjunct that is responsible for the presence of fire where there is smoke, or can it be an uncaused relation ' Then he examines the kitchen to find the attributes that pervade both fire and smoke The attribute 'knowability' is common to fire and smoke. This cannot affect the relation of smoke to fire There are certain other attributes that are absent from both, for instance, the attribule of being kitchen This too cannot affect the relation

1 स्वाभाविकस्सम्बन्ध व्याप्तिः। MM, p 28

of smoke to fire So he comes to the definite conclusion that there is no extraneous adjunct which can prove the non-existence of fire where there is smoke Here the knowledge of invariable concomitance is determined by repeated observation of the co-existence of smoke and fire

The Naiyāyika accepts contact through generality (sāmānya-lakṣana-pratyāsatti), for the knowledge of invariable concomitance (vyāptijñāna) between all smokes and all fires But the Bhātta maintains that invariable concomitance in the form of a universal generalisation, is not a necessary condition of inference. Fire is observed to be co-existent with smoke in two or three places, and smoke is never seen to be present in a place where fire is not present When one comes to have this experience repeatedly within the sphere of one's observation, one finds one self in a position to make out invariable connection between smoke and fire in the form in which they happen to be seen in the particular instances which have come within the scope of one's observation When one later on happens to see smoke in the same form in an unobserved place as in a place already observed, or even when one happens to see smoke in the same form in an observed place as already observed there, one's mind comes to have a knowledge of the presence of fire in that place where smoke is seen for the moment The knowledge of fire which thus arises cannot be regarded as perceptional experience as fire is not for the moment within the range of any of the senses , nor can it be regarded as reproduction in memory of a past experience, since the knowledge of fire which thus arises is felt to be experience having reference to the exisence of fire in the present time Universal generalisations themselves are cases of inference

The Bhāṭṭā classifies inference in three different ways The first classification divides inference into two types They are[1] :— 1) Positively and negatively concomitant— (anvaya

1 तच्चानुमान त्रिविधम् । अन्वयव्यतिरेकि, केवलाऽन्वयि, केवलव्यतिरेकि चेति । ....त च कौमारिला: प्रायो नेच्छन्ति व्यतिरेकिणम् ।
ibid, pp. 35-37

vyatireki), and 2) purely positively concomitant (kevalānvayi) Invariable concomitance indeed is of two kinds, namely, 1) positive invariable concomitance— the existence of the probandum where there is the existence of the probans, e g, where there is smoke there is fire, and 2) negative invariable concomitance— the non-existence of the probans where there is the non-existence of the probandum, e g, where there is non-existence of fire there is non existence of smoke

That which admits both the types of invariable concomitance that is positive and negatively con-comitant inference, e g, smoke as the means of fire inference Here we are getting two types of invariable concomitances The positive is "wherever there is smoke there is fire, as in the kitchen", and the negative invariable concomitance is "wherever there is no fire there is no smoke, as in the lake"

That which admits only positive invariable concomitance that is purely positive concomitant, e g, 'cognition is manifested by another cognition, because it is an object, like a jar' Here there is no negative invariable concomitance for the above inference, because all cognitions are taken as constituting the subject term

The Naiyāyika accepts the purely negatively concomitant also, but the Bhāṭṭa maintains that what the Naiyāyika would treat as inference based purely on negative concomitance is really no inference at all and demands a distinct place as a means of valid knowledge, viz, the presumption, since it lacks the essential feature of inference – viz, direct subsumption to positive concomitance

The positively and negatively concomitant probans has five aspects,[1] namely, being the attribute of the subject, existence in the co-subject, non-existence in counter subjects, non-sublation of its sphere and having no counter probans Here, the subject is the mountain, where the probandum is sought to be

1 अत्र चान्वयव्यतिरेकिहेतो: पञ्च रूपाणि पक्षधर्मत्वम्, सपक्षे सत्वम्, विपक्षाद् व्यावृत्तत्वम्, अबाधितविषयत्वम्, असत्प्रतिपक्षत्वञ्चेति MM, p 60

known Existence of the probans there is 'being the attribute of the subject' The co-subject is the kitchen where the probandum has been ascertained To be there is 'existence in the co-subject' The counter subject is the lake, where the non-existence of the probandum has been ascertained Not to be there is 'non-existence in the counter subject' Non sublation of the probandum is 'non-sublation of its sphere' Non existence of an opposite probandum is 'having no counter probans'

But the purely positively concomitant can have no non-existence in the counter subject, as there is no counter subject Therefore here its aspects are four only[1]

According to the second classification, there are two types of inference The Prābhākaras also accept the division, but their division is quite different from that of Bhattas The Prābhākara's division is — 1) the inference of perceptible objects (drsta), e g, fire from smoke and 2) the inference of non-perceptible objects (sāmānyato drsta), e g, the inference of the existence of the visual sense organ from the visual perception of colour, etc

The Bhāttā's division is — 1) the particularly seen, that whose content is only the particular seen object, e g, by seeing Kṛttikā rise, there is the inference of Rohinī, and 2) the generically seen, that whose content is general, e g, by seeing smoke, there is the inference of fire[2]

Śabarasvāmin explains the division as that inference based upon the directly perceived relationship (pratyaksato drsta-sambandha) and inference based upon a generalised relationship (sāmānyato drsṭa sambandha), but Kumārila explains Śabara's pratyaksato drsṭa sambandha as the inference of one particular from another particular— where the invariable concomitance of two particulars is known— taking the word perce-

1 ibid, p 60

2 प्रत्यक्षदृष्टसम्बन्ध ययोरेव विशेपयो. ।
गोमयेन्धनतज्जन्यविशेषादिमति कृता ॥
SV, Anumāna, st. 141

ption (pratyakṣa) in the sence of particular (viśesa), in contrast, with generality (sāmānya) in the latter[1] He further says that this kind of inference of a particular is acceptable to Vindhyavāsin', who is identified with Iśvarakrsna But Iśvarakṛṣṇa has admitted three kinds of inference in his Sāmkhya-kārikā. Vācaspati miśra, in his commentary, has brought these three under two categories, namely, vīta and avita, the former being held to include both Pūrvavat and Sāmānyato dṛṣta-anumānas and the latter only Śesavat-anumāna

The third classification also comprises two types , 1) inference for one's own benefit (svarthānumāna) and 2) inference for the benefit of others (parārthānumāna) A person having himself repeatedly observed, in the kitchen and other places, the invariable concomitance of smoke with fire, goes near a hill and sees smoke on it He recollects that, wherever there is smoke, there is fire, and there upon knowledge arises in him that 'this hill has smoke which has invariable concomitance with fire' and from which follows the knowledge that 'this hill has fire', which is called inferential knowledge This is the process of inference for one's own benefit

When a person, having inferred fire from smoke, demonstrates it to others by the employment of a syllogism It is called an inference for the benefit of others According to the Naiyāyika, the syllogism consists of five members, but the Bhāṭṭas accept that of three members

A member is a sentence that gives rise to inferential knowledge On the employment of the five sentences there arises, at first, knowledge from each of them separately Then arises collective knowledge from the five sentences combined together The members are five, viz. 1) Proposition (pratijñā) , 2) reason (hetu) ; 3) example (udāharana) , 4) subsumptive correlative (upanaya) ; and 5) conclusion (nigamana)[3]

1 Epistemology of the Bhāṭṭa school of Pūrvamīmāmsā, p. 251

2 विशेषदृष्टमेतच्च लिखित विन्ध्यवासिना, SV, Anumāna, st 143

3 प्रतिज्ञा–हेतु–उदाहरण–उपनय–निगमनानि पञ्चावयवा: । TS, p. 98

The proposition is a sentence which causes knowledge whose object is the same as that of the conclusion and which contributes to the production of the entire knowledge which produces consideration (parāmarsa), e g 'This hill has fire'

The reason is an expression with the ablative suffex attachedto it, which produces knowledge whose object is not the probandum but which contributes to the production of the entire knowledge that gives rise to consideration, e g 'because it has smoke'

The example is an expression which, while producing knowledge of connection of the form that the locus of the probans is constantly occupied by the probandum, causes another knowledge which proceeds from the sentence expressive of application, e g. 'All that has smoke has fire, as in a kitchen'

The application is a member which produces consideration, e g 'this hill has smoke.'

The conclusion is an expression which, while causing the knowledge which gives rise to consideration, produces knowledge of the probandum as indicated by that of the probans through its invariable concomitance with the probandum and its nature of abiding in the subject, e g '(therefore) this hill has fire'[1]

This hill has fire—	Proposition
(Because) this hill has smoke—	Reason
All that has smoke has fire, as in a kitchen—	Example
This hill has smoke—	Application
(Therefore) this hill has fire—	Conclusion

Here, one may think that there is no difference between the proposition and the conclusion and also between the reason and the application The sentence 'this hill has fire' occurs twice, once in the place of proposition and again in the place of conclusion Also the sentence 'this hill has smoke' occurs twice, once in the place of reason and again in the place of

1 पर्वतो वह्निमानिति प्रतिज्ञा। धूमवत्वात् इति हेतु। यो यो धूमवान् स स वह्निमान्, यथा महानस इत्युदाहरणम्। तथा च अयमिति उपनयः। तस्मात्तथेति निगमनम्। TS, p 98

applıcatıon Therefore to avoıd the repetıtion, the Mīmāṁsakas accept only three members, eıther endıng with the example (vız , the propositıon, the reason and the example), or begınnıng wı'h the example, (vız , the example, the applıcatıon and the conclusıon)[1]

The Buddhıst accepts only two members, vız , 1) the example and 2) the applıcatıon, e g 'all that has smoke has fire, as ın a kıtchen (example), and thıs has smoke (applıcatıon)' We may see here that ıt wıll result ın the defect of the probandum element havıng to be ımported Therefore dıscardıng the Buddhıst's vıew the Bhāṭta accepts three membered syllogısm

Among the three members also, Śabarasvāmın, ın hıs Bhāsya — 'Whatever ıs an act ıs always found to lead to a result,— the offerıng ınto fire ıs an act,— hence thıs offerıng also must lead to result'[2] saying thus, he favours the endıng wıth the example vıew But Kumārila, "All study of the Veda ıs preceded by the teacher's study (of it), because thıs ıs (and always has been) a unıversal characteristic of Vedıc study just lıke Vedıc study of the present day"[3] sayıng thus, he favours the begınnıng wıth the example vıew

PRĀBHĀKARA VIEW

Śabarasvāmın defines ınference as follows 'When the perceptıon of one factor of a well-recognısed relatıonshıp (of ınvarıable concomıtance) leads to the knowledge of the other factor of that relatıonshıp,— whıch latter ıs not ın contact wıth the person s sense-organs,— thıs latter knowledge ıs ınference (Anumānam jñātasambandhasya ekadeśa-darśanād ekadeśāntare asannıkrste arthe buddhıḥ[4]) Accordıng to Kumārıla, the com-

1 तच्च पञ्चतय केचिद् द्वयमन्ये वय त्रयम् ।
उदाहरणपर्यन्त यद्वोदाहरणादिकम् ॥ SD, p 64

2 अथ यत्कर्म तत्फलवद् दृष्टम् । होमोऽपि कर्म तेनापि फलवता भवितव्यम् । SBh, 2-2-11

3 वेदस्याध्ययन सर्वं गुर्वध्ययनपूर्वकम् ।
वेदाध्ययनसामान्यादधुनाध्ययन यथा ॥
SV, Vākyādhıkaraṇa (on JS, 1-1-24) p 366

4 SBh, p. 36

pound 'jñātasambandhasya', in this definition, does not qualify the word 'ekadeśa' in the compound 'ekadeśadarśanāt', meaning one whose concomitant-relation with another is known[1] Hence he interpre's that the word 'jñātasambandhasya' denotes either the person who knows well the relationship (jñātaḥ sambandhah yena) or, the subject where the relationship of probans and probandum is known (jñātah sambandhaḥ yasmin)

Prabhākara rejects Kumārila's interpretation and says that there is no objection in qualifying this first word with the part of the second[2] Therefore Śālikanātha defines inference as follows 'when the perception of one (viz, probans) of known concomitant relationship leads to the knowledge of the other (probandum) of the relationship,— which latter is not contradicted by any o her knowledge,- this latter knowledge is inference' (jnātasambandha-niyamas yaeka deśasya darśanāt ekadeśāntare buddhih anumānam abādhite)[3] Further he sets forth that the relationship upon which inference is based must be one that is unfailing, ever true and permanent[4], e g, that which subsists between the cause and the effect, between the whole and the part, between the substance and the quality, between qualities subsisting in the same substane and so forth ; for instance, the relationship between fire (cause) and smoke (effect)

As noted above, in case we happen to possess that two objects (say, the probans and the probandum) are such that probandum exists wherever probans does and also the knowledge that a particular thing possesses probans, there ensues inferential knowledge to the effect that this thing possesses probandum, even though probandum is not seen there This invariable concomitance between probans and probandum is free from all types of limitations, that will assume the form of

1 न ह्युपमर्जन पद पदान्तरेण सम्बध्यते राजपुरुषवत् ।
Gramatically one word can not be used to quality the first part of another compound word. BT, p. 91, f

2 आकाङ्क्षित पूरणसमर्थं च सम्बन्धितामापद्यते । अत्र चैकदेशदर्शनादित्युक्ते कस्यैकदेशस्येत्याकाङ्क्षा । BT, p 92

3 PP, p 116

4 RV, p 49

a universal generalisation, when a person inferes fire in a mountain on seeing smoke there, he is, infact, cognising again what has already been cognized and only forms part of the content of the generalisation at which he had arrived as a result of his earlier observations

Such inference is a vaild experience, even though it cognises that which is already cognised The inferential experience is re-experience and does not involve the passage of the mind from the known to the unknown, as is commonly supposed to be the cause , but it involves merely the passage of the mind from a known object to something that is already known to be invariably connected with it[1]. The Prābhākaras take this generalisation to be of a universal type and to have reference to all the conceivable particulars— unobserved as well as observed The Bhāttas think that the invariable concomitance in the form of universal generalisation is not a necessary condition of inference , but the knowledge of co-presence of the probandum with the probans in two or three places leads one to form an idea of invariable concomitance The Prābhākara argues that the relation (between fire and smoke) once seen in the subject (viz , kitchen) naturally leads a person to form an idea of universal generalisation of it free from all the limitations With the help of the generatisation one, on seeing the smoke in new places actually apprehends again the same relation of it with the fire in the same place and this is known as inference.

A single observation of probans and probandum is enough to give the knowledge of their invariable concomitance But the doubts regarding extraneous adjuncts are removed after repeated observations only.

The Prābhākara also, like the Bhāṭṭa, classifies inference in three different ways The first classification is the same as with the Bhāṭṭa, but the second classification is a different one. First of all, Śabarasvāmin classifies inference under two types,

1 नन्वेव सम्बन्धनियमावसायसमय एव यावद्धूमादिभावितया अग्न्यादि-सम्बन्धस्यावगमात्, धूमादिसत्तानिश्चयादधिक निश्चेतव्य नावशिष्यत इत्यनुमान न प्रमाण स्यात् । PP, p. 205

viz., 1) the inference based upon the directly perceived relationship, and 2) the inference based upon a generalised relationship. Kumārila bhatta, over ruling the terminology and the illustrations of the Bhāṣyakāra, classifies in his own way. But Prabhākara, following the Bhāṣyakāra, classifies inference into two divisions[1], viz., the dṛṣṭa svalakṣaṇa-viṣaya (that of which the specific individuality is perceived), e.g., all such things as fire and the like, and the adṛṣṭa svalakṣaṇa-viṣaya (that of which the said feature is not perceived), e.g., such super-sensuous as the movement and the like. We may notice here that this two fold division is based on a two fold division of the objects of inference.

Movement is perceptible in other schools of Indian philosophy. But the Prābhākaras advocate the super-sensuous nature of movement; movement can not be perceived and what we actually perceive when a thing is in motion is its conjunction with one thing and disjunction with another. Then, when we observe a thing having conjunction and disjunction occasionally we infer that there must be some cause which produces them. Therefore, the cause, which is different from the productions (conjunction and disjunction), must be movement[2].

The third classification, (the inference for one's own benefit, and the inference for the benefit of others) is common to the Bhāttas and the Prābhākaras[3]. Even in the inference for the benefit of others, the Prābhākaras, like the Bhāttas, accept three membered syllogism, viz., the proposition, the reason and the example[4].

1 अदृष्टस्वलक्षणविषयमनुमानमस्ति क्रियादिषु । BT, p 98

2 PP, p 215–218

3 द्वेधाऽनुमानमुत्पद्यते— स्वयमनुसंहितयाऽनुमानोत्पादकसामग्र्या, परप्रयुक्तवाक्योद्बोधितया वा । PP, p 220

4 'तत्राऽबाधित' इति प्रतिज्ञा । 'ज्ञातसम्बन्धनियमस्ये'त्यनेन दृष्टान्तवचनम् । 'एकदेशदर्शनादिति' हेत्वभिधानम् । PP, p 220

THE FALLACY

BHĀṬṬA VIEW

Inference is described as defectless probans Now the question arises that what are the defects of the probans We can say that the defects are those factors which prevent us from having the knowledge intended to be conveyed by the inference, and sometimes cause uncertain and erroneous knowledge Kumārila explains three kinds of fallacies, viz , 1] the fallacy of proposition [pratijñābhāsa], 2] the fallacy of reason [hetvābhāsa] and the fallacy of example [dṛṣṭāntābhāsa][1]

The fallacy of proposition [pratijñābhāsa] is of three kinds, viz , 1] the sublation by his very words [svoktibādha], 2] the sublation by the common usage [loka-viruddha] and 3] the sublation by previous statement [pūrva-vākyabādha][2] When a person says 'all my life I have been silent' then there is sublation by his words, because silent man can not speak When a person says 'the moon [indu]' is not expressed by the word 'moon' [candra] this is opposed by the word, because it is settled in the word that the moon [indu] is expressed by the word moon [candra] When a person who previously establishes the non-eternality of sound and after, says 'sound is eternal' then there is sublation by previous statement

There can be six kinds of fallacies of proposition in an inference, according to the modes of sublating means of right knowledge They are – the sublation—by perception, by inference, by verbal testimony, by analogy, by presumption, by non-apprehension 'Fire is not hot' is an example for the sublation by perception Here, since fire's hotness is already establihed by perception the absence of hotness is sublated[3] When an inference is found to be clearly stronger than the another

1 त्रिधा शब्दविरोध स्यात्प्रतिज्ञादिविभागतः। SV, Anu. st. 61

2 प्रतिज्ञापूर्वसञ्जल्प–सर्वलोकप्रसिद्धितः।
यावज्जीवमहृ मौनीत्युक्तिमात्रेण बाध्यते ॥ SV, Anu st 62

3 अग्नावबाहृके साध्ये.... । SV, Anu. st. 67

then there is sublation by inference in the latter, e g, 'Mind can not be a sense organ, because it is not of the nature of an element like space' Here, since mind is inferred to be a sense organ by the very inference which apprehends the thing called mind its being a non-sense organ is sublated

'Sacrifice, etc can not be the means to heaven, since they are actions, like walking' is an example for the sublation by verbal testimony Here, since sacrifice, etc, are known to be means to heaven from Vedic texts the absence of instrumentality is sublated 'A cow can not be like a gavaya, because it is a living being like a man' is an example for the sublation by analogy Here, since cow is known similar to gavaya through the means of analogy the dissimilarity is sublated[1] 'Devadatta is not out side, because he is not seen there' is an example for the sublation by presumption Here, since Devadatta's out sideness is established through the means of presumption he is not outside is sublated[2] 'Air has colour, because it is a substance like earth' is an example for the sublation by non-apprehension Here, since the absence of colour in the air is established through the means of non-apprehension the air has colour is sublated

The word 'hetvābhāsa' [fallacy of reason] is capable of two derivations and two meanings If it is dissolved as 'hetuvad ābhāsate', that which looks like a reason, it means a fallacious reason If it is dissolved as 'hetor ābhāsaḥ', the word would mean a fallacy, i e the error which underlines the apparent reason and makes it invalid Actually, the second derivation is appropriate in the context because, all types of fallacies are based on different kinds of errors of reasons and not on those of fallacious probans

Pārthasārathi accepts the fallacy [of reason] of three kinds, viz, 1] the unestablished [asiddha], 2] the unconclusive

1 न गोर्गवयसादृश्य तस्य बाधोपमानत । SV, Anu st 66

2 गेहावगतनास्तित्वो जीवश्चैत्रो यदा बहि· ।
नास्तीति साध्यते बाधस्तत्रार्थपत्तितो भवेत् ।। SV, Anu st 67

[anaikāntika] and 3] the sublated [bādhita][1], But Rāmakrsna Bhatta[2], Cidānanda[3], Nārāyana[4] and other Neo-Bhāṭṭas accept the fallacy of four kinds, the fourth being the uncommon [asādhārana]

The unestablished is of five kinds They are — 1] the unestablished in respect of itself [svārupāsiddha], 2] the unestablished in raspect of its relation [sambandhāsiddha], 3] the unestablished in respect of its presence elsewhere [vyatirekā siddha], 4] the unestablished in respect of its substratum [āśrayāsiddha] and 5] the unestablished in respect of its concomitance [vyāpyatvāsiddha]

'Buddha is cognizant of Dharma, because he is omniscient' is an example for the unestablished in respect of itself Here, since omniscience does not exist anywhere, the reason 'is ommiscient' becomes unestablished in respect of itself 'Fire does not burn, because it is cold' is an example for the unestablished in respect of its relation Here, since the relation between coolness and fire is against the experience the reason 'is cold' becomes unestablished in respect of its relation 'Cow is an animal having dewlop, because it is denoted by the word 'cow' is an example for the unestablished in respect of its presence elsewhere is found Here, since the denotation by the word 'Cow' has no existence apart from the subject [pakṣa], the reason is denoted by the word 'cow' becomes unestablished in respect of its presence elsewhere.

'Sky-lotus is fragrant, because it is a lotus like a lake lotus' is an example for the unestablished in respect of its substratum Here, since the subject sky-lotus has no existence the reason becomes unestablished in respct of its substratum When the reason resides only in a part of the subject, then that is known as the unestablished in respect of its invariable concomitance

1 असिद्धि अनैकान्तिकत्व बाधकत्व चेति त्रयो हेतुदोषा: तत्रासिद्धि पञ्चधा.... । SD, p. 64
2 SC, p. 66
3 NTV, p 142
4 MM, p 78

For example, 'Air and also space are non-eternal, because they are tangible'. Here, since the reason tangibility resides only in a part of the subject, i e air, not in the other part, i e space [because space is not tangible], the reason 'are tangible' becomes unestablished in respect of its concomitance This is known by the name 'the partly non-established' also

The unconclusive reason is of two kinds, viz , 1] the irregular or the common [savyabhicāra] and 2] the opposable [sapratisādhana][1] The reason which is present in a place where there is the absence of the thing to be proved, is the irregular For example, 'Sound is eternal, because it is tangible' Here, since tangibility exists in an action also where there is the absence of eternality, the reason 'is eternal' becomes common to normal inference and its opposite inference also

When there are two reasons leading to conflicting inferences and there is no decision as to which of the two is the real one, it is called the opposable For example, 'Air is perceptible, because it possesses finite magnitude' and 'Air is imperceptible, because it is a substance without colour' Here, there are two reasons 1] 'having a finite magnitude' and 2] 'being a substance without colour,' both leading to conflicting inferences They appear to be equally cogent and it is difficult to determine whether air is perceptible or imperceptible

The sublative [bādhita] reason, according to some Mīmāmsakas, is of six kinds[2], viz 1] the sublation of the existence of probandum [dharma svarūpa bādha], 2] the sublation of the existence of subject [dharmi-svarūpa-bādha], 3] the sublation of the existence of the both [ubhaya svarūpa-bādha], 4] the sublation of a particular property of probandum [dharma-viśesa-bādha], 5] the sublation of a particular property of subject [dharmi-viśesa-bādha] and 6] the sublation of a particular property of the both [ubhaya-

1 अनैकान्तिकत्व द्विविधम् – सव्यभिचार सप्रतिसाधन च ।
नित्यः शब्दो मूर्तत्वादिति कर्मादिष्वनित्व । SD, p 65

2 तथा बाधको नाम हेत्वाभासो यो विरुद्ध इति तार्किकैराभिधीयते ।
स च षड्विध इति केचित् । ... SD, p 66

vi-śeṣa-bādha] Some Mīmāmsakas regard the sublated reason is of four kinds They would not count the third and sixth i e ubhaya-svarūpa-bādha and ubhaya-viśeṣa-bādha, as independent fallacies Some Mīmāmsakas consider the fallacy is of one kind

Actually, the sublative is of two kinds, viz the sub lation of existance of probandum and the sublation of particular property of probandum When the reason is pervaded by the opposite of the probandum that is called the sublation of existence of probandum. For example, 'Sound is eternal, because it is produced' Here, since the reason 'is produced' pervades the opposite of the probandum 'non-eternality', the reason is known as the sublation of existence of probandum.

When the reason is pervaded by a particular opposite of a particular probandum that is called the sublation of particular property of probandum For example, 'Earth has a creator, because it is an effect like a jar' Here, the reason rules out the disembodied character of the creator, because the creator in the case of a jar etc, is always seen to be an embodied being It proves the non existence of a particular property 'disembodiedness' of the probandum 'creator', hence it is known as the sublation of particular property of probandum

The example [udāharana] is that, where the pervasion between the probandum and the probans is grasped This is of two kinds, viz the positive and the negative When positive similarity lies in pointing out the concomitance of the probans with probandum example is positive, e g 'What has smoke has fire, like a kitchen' Whenne gative similarity consists in pointing out the concomitance of the absence of the probandum with the absence of the probans example is negative, e g 'What has no fire, does not have smoke, like a lake' The fallacy of example is of four kinds, viz ,[1] 1] the devoid of probandum

1 साध्यहेतूभयव्याप्तिशून्यत्वात्परमार्थतः ।
नित्यो ध्वनिरमूर्तत्वात्कर्मवत् परमाणुवत् ॥ SV, Anu., st. 115

[sādhya-śūnya], 2] the devoid of probans [sādhana-śūnya], 3] the devoid of the both [ubhaya-sūnya] and 4] the devoid of a base [āśraya śūnya]

'Sound is eternal, because it has no cause [what has no cause is eternal] like prior non existence' is an example for the devoid of probandum Here the example 'prior-non-existence' is not eternal and devoided by the probandum 'eternality' Hence it called the devoid of probandum 'Sound is eternal, because it has no cause like destruction' is an example for the devoid of probans Here, the example 'destruction' is causal, and devoided by the probans 'causeless' Hence it becomes devoided by the probans 'Sound is eternal, because it has no cause like a jar' is an example for the devoid of the both. Here, the example 'jar' is non eternal and causal and devoided by the both, i e probandum 'eternality' and probans 'causeless' Hence it becomes devoid by the both 'Sound is eternal, because it has no cause like a hare's horn' is an example for the devoid of the base Here, the base for the example is 'hare's horn' which is not real Hence it is known as the devoid of the base

The fallacies of example having possitive similarity are four as described above and having negative similarity also become another four veraities

PRĀBHĀKARA VIEW

The Prābhākara, like the Bhāṭṭa, accepts the fallacy is of three types, viz , 1] the fallacy of proposition, 2] the fallacy of reason, and 3] the fallacy of example Gautama, the founde- of Nyāya sehool, accepts that the hurting proposition [pratijñār hāni] is different from the renouncing proposition [pratijñā-samnyāsa] His aphorism as follows : — The points of defeat are the hurting proposition, the shifting proposition, the opposing proposition, the renouncing proposition[1] ' Śālika-

1 प्रतिज्ञाहानि. प्रतिज्ञान्तर प्रतिज्ञाविरोध. प्रतिज्ञासन्यासो....
ND, 5-2-1

natha criticizes the view and establishes that the hurting proposition is identical with the renouncing proposition[1]

The Prābhākara accepts the fallacy of reason is of four kinds, viz, 1] the uncommon [asādharana], 2] the common [sādhārana] 3] the unestablished [asiddha] and 4] the sublated [bādhita][2] The reason which is absent from both similar instances [sapaksa] and contrary instances [vipakṣa] is called the fallacy of uncommon [asādhārana] A similar instance [sapaksa] is what is definitely known to be possessed of the thing to be inferred A contrary instance is what is definitely known to be devoid of the thing to be inferred When in a proposition like 'Sound is transitory, because it has sound-hood' there is doubt of transitoriness in sound, then a jar or the like constitutes a similar instance, as also a contrary instance, and sound hood is other than that, hence it is an unconmon reason

The reason which is present in both similar instances [sapakṣa] and contrary instances [vipaksa] is called the fallacy of common [sādhārana], The mention of similar instance is to exclude the contradictory reason Strictly speaking, presence in contrary instances should alone be mentioned, for although the contradictory reason is also a common reason, yet it is distinct from the latter, as the ground of its fallaciousness is different.

The fallacy of unestablished [asiddha] is of five kinds, viz, 1] unestablished in respect of itself [svarūpāsiddha], 2] unestablished in respect of relation [sambandhāsiddha] 3] unestablished in respect of presence elsewhere [vyatirekāsiddha] 4] unestablished in respect of its substratum [āśrayāsiddha] and 5] unestablished in respect of its concomitance [vyāpyatvāsiddha][3].

That which is never present in what is possessed of the thing to be inferred [the subject] is called the sublated reason

1 प्रतिज्ञासन्न्यासाच्च प्रतिज्ञाहानिरभिन्नैव । PP, p 227

2 हेतोर्दूषणमसिद्धत्व (स्वरूपासिद्धत्वमेकदेशासिद्धत्व)मसाधारणत्वं साधारणत्व बाधितविषयत्वञ्चेति । PP, p 225

3 supra, p. 45

[bādhita] This fallacy is called contradictory [viruddha] by the Naiyāyikas[1]

The Naiyāyika enumerates the fallacy of the probans as five, namely, the unestablished [asiddha], the contradictory [viruddha], the unconclusive [anaikāntika] the similar to the context [prakaranasama], and the discarded [kālātyayāpadiṣṭa]' Some Naiyāyikas speak of the inefficient [aprayojaka] as the sixth Bhāsarvajña, the author of Nyāyasāra, says that the sixth is the non determined [anadhyavasāya]

The Naiyāyika counts 'the similar to the context' [prakarana-sama] as an independent fallacy The Bhāṭṭa, identifying it with the second variety of the unconclusive [anaikāntika], namely, the sapratisādhana, includes it in to the unconclusive The Bhāṭṭa's argument is as follows— it occurs when there are two reasons leading to conflicting inferences and therefore there is no decision as to which of the two is the real one E g 'Air is non-perceptible, because it has no colour, like the mind' and 'Air is perceptible, because it has touch, like a jar'

The Neo-Bhāṭṭa includes it in the defects of the subject [pakṣadosa] His argument is that there can not possibly be a pair of reasons of equal strength , if it could be so, it would follow that the very same object has two opposite natures, brought about by the force of the two inferences If there is conflict between a stronger and a weaker, the content of the weaker will be removed by the stronger, and this defect is but the defect of the subject [pakṣa-doṣa], namely 'the sublation of the attribute' [bādhita-viśeṣaṇa].[3]

The Prābhākara rejects the above views and argues that two contradictory reasons can not be equally powerful and can not be predicated of the subject simultaneously If it were not so the resulant doubt could never be removed In the

1 See supra p 45.
2 ते च असिद्ध-विरुद्धानैकान्तिकप्रकरणसमकालात्ययापदिष्ट भेदात् पञ्चैव । TB, p. 11.
3 MM, pp 79–80.

examples, the Prābhākara says, the latter reason is more powerful and leads to the perceptibility of air[1].

As described above the Bhāṭṭa accepts the fallacy of three kinds, viz 1] the unestablished [asiddha] 2] the sublated [bādhita] 3] the unconclusive [anaikāntika] The Prābhākara accepts the fallacy of four kinds, viz , 1] the unestablished [asiddha] 2] the sublated [bādhita] 3] the common [sādhārana] 4] the uncommon [asādhārana] The first two are common to both the schools Regarding the third, the Bhātta calls it as the unconclusive [anaikāntika] and the Prābhakara calls it as the common [sādhārana] Here the difference lies only in the terminology The uncommon [asādhārana] is accepted, as fourth fallacy, by the Prābhākara The old-Bhāṭṭas do not favour to accept it as a fallacy, but the Neo-Bhāṭṭas follow the Prābhākara view and accept the uncommon [asādhārana] as the fourth fallacy of reason[2]

Śalikanātha enumerates the fallacy of example is of five kinds,[3] viz , 1] the devoid of probans [sādhana-vikala], 2] the devoid of probandum [sādhya-vikala], 3] the devoid of probans and probandum [ubhayaśūnya], 4] the devoid of invariable concomitance [sambandha-niyama-śūnya] and 5] the example whose invariable concomitance is inversely stated [viparīta-niyama] Of these, the first three are common to both the schools.

'The mind is non eternal, because it is corporeal like a pot' is an example for the fallacy of example defective in the invariable concomitance Here, since there is no invariable concomitance or universal connection between corporeality and non-eternality, it becomes defective in the invariable concomitance 'The mind is non-eternal, because it is corporeal, whatever is non-eternal is corporeal like, a pot' is an example for the fallacy of example whose invariable concomi-

1 प्राभाकरमीमासकास्तु–प्रकरणसमत्व दूषणान्तर न सभवति । प्रबलदुर्बलयोर्विरोधे… Viṣama sthala ṭippaṇi on PP, p. 227.

2 See supra p. 45.

3 दृष्टान्तस्य च साध्यविकलता… PP, p. 227.

tance is inversely stated Here, the invariable concomitance should have been stated thus 'whatever is corporael is non-eternal, like a pot'

We can see here that both the schools are wrongly enumerated the fallacies of example. Because the fallacies of example are six as ennumerated by the Naiyāyika. The Bhāṭṭa accepts four and leaves two, viz, example devoid of invariable concomitance and the example whose invariable concomitance inversely stated, and the Prābhākara accepts five and leaves one, viz, the devoid of base.

VERBAL TESTIMONY

Verbal testimony is the third of the means of valid knowledge accepted by the Mīmāṁsakas. The Naiyayikas accept analogy after inference, but the Mīmāṁsakas, due to its wide recognition by a large number of disputants, give priority to verbal testimony.

The Vaiseṣika maintains that verbal testimony is not a distinct means of valid knowledge, it is included in inference In deriving knowledge from speech we first hear the words constituting the speech and then recollect the related things Thus recollection, is designated as verbal knowledge And this, according to the Vaiśeṣika, is derived through inference

Kumārila criticises the Vaiśeṣika view on the grounds that the verbal knowledge is not, like inferential knowledge, dependent on the knowledge of invariable concomitance between the words of speech and knowledge of the mutual connection of things signified by them, but results immediately from the words as soon as expectancy [ākānksā] consistency [yogyatā], etc, existing among them have been known Again, after verbal knowledge has been produced, there arises self-consciousness of the form "I know from the speech" but not of the form "I know through the inference"[1]

1 SV, Śabda, st. 15–111

Śabarasvāmin defines verbal testimony as follows •— Verbal testimony is that means of cognising the object not in contact with the senses, [i e dharma and adharma] which follows from verbal cognition" [Śāstram śabda vijñānād asannikṛste arthe jñānam][1] Śabarasvāmin does not define verbal testimony in general, but only the particular form of that, i e injunction, because it is only in reference to the means of cognising Dharma, which has been declared to be injunction alone Hence, according to him, the term 'Śabda stands for the Vedic word, and 'Artha' for Dharma and Adharma

The word 'Śabda-vijñāna' is capable of two interpretations It means the knowledge derived from the word, ['śabdād vijñānam] 'or the knowledge which underlies the word ['śabde vijnānam.'] The Prābhākara accep's second derivation According to him, the word 'Śabda-vijnāna' stands for the knowledge of things through the words, i e the knowledge of some thing to be done The Bhāṭṭa accepts bo h the derivations and do not restrict the verbal testimony only to Vedic injunctions, as is done by the Prābhākara

Even though the Bhāsyakāra has defined verbal testimony under the name of Vedic injunction [śāstra], but he does not-confine verbal testimony to the Vedic injuctions only, because he says that the words in their meanings are the same in the Veda ard in common parlance[2] Hence verbal testimony to common paralance is acceptable to him

BHĀṬṬA VIEW

Kumārila's definition of verbal testimony is as follows "That is called verbal testimony, by which men understand what is to be undertaken and what is to be avoided, whether such injnction comes from the eternal Veda or from a human source".[3]

1 SBh p. 105

2 य एव लौकिकाश्शब्दास्त एव वैदिकास्त एव तेषामर्थाः । SBh, 1-3-11

3 प्रवृत्तिर्वा निवृत्तिर्वा नित्येन कृतकेन च ।
पुंसां येनोपदिश्येत तच्छास्त्रमभिधीयते ॥ SV śabda, st 4

Pārthasārathi explains Bhāṣyakara's definition as follows :– The comprehension of the meaning of a sentence through the recollection of the meanings of words which are apprehended by sense of hearing, is the means of right knowledge known as verbal testimony[1]

The verbal testimony is of two kinds, viz, the human [laukika] and the scriptural [vaidika] The human is the statement of trust-worthy persons and the scriptural is the Vedic statement which is eternal

The Naiyāyikas do not accept eternity of the Vedas and they ascribe their authorship to God. Their argument is as follows :— 'The Vedas are of human origins because, they are a collection of sentences, like the Mahābhārata, etc' this inference establishes that the Vedas must have been effected by some one. As no human origin is possible in the case of works of such transcendental wisdom, they must be the works of God Thus the Vedas are the compositions of God

The Mīmāṁsaka's answer to the argument is that the above inference is vitiated with the defect of adventitious condition viz, the 'remembrance of the authorship of the work' and if there were an author, he should certainly have been remembered Hence the Vedas are eternal [beginningless] And this is proved by the fact that all words and things denoted by the Vedas are eternal

The Vedic statement is of two kinds, viz, [denotative of] existent [siddhārthaka] and [of] mandatory [vidhāyaka] That which is denotative of some thing that is existent is called the existent and that which is denotative of a mandate is called the mandatory The mandatory also undergoes two divisions, viz, direct teaching [upadeśa] and transfer [atideśa] 'Thus has it to be done' this is direct teaching E g In the common usage : 'Devadatta should be treated to a dinner consisting of curds, ghee, lintil soup, and fine rice, etc In the Veda ; 'one should perform the New-moon-day and Full-moon-day sacri-

1 विज्ञाताच्छब्दात्पदार्थाभिधानद्वारेण यद्वाक्यार्थविज्ञान तच्छाब्द नाम प्रमाणम् । SD, p 72

fices after first performing the Prayāja and getting the rice by pounding, etc 'Like that this has to be done', this is tranfer E g In the common usage, 'Like Devadatta Yajñadatta should be treated to a dinner' In the Veda ; 'Like the Āgneya sacrifice Saurya sacrifice should be performed'[1]

The direct teaching and the transfer are occupying important roles in Mīmāmsā The first six chapters of the Jaimini sūtras describe the direct teaching and the second six chapters describe the transfer

Sentence is a combination of words and meaning of the sentence is obtained by the coherent construction of the meanings of words in the sentence through implication The coherent construction of the meanings which are already got from the words is meaning of the sentence, that is to say, first the words give only unconnected meanings, and it is only after this, that the connection among the meaning is understood Thus the meaning of the sentence as a whole is merely the synthetic construction of the meanings of the constituent words of the sentence This theory known as 'Abhihitānvaya vāda' Thus, when a boy hears the sentence, 'gām ānaya' [bring a cow] First the meanings of the constituent words are comprehended one after another Thus, by 'Gām' is meant the cow as the object and by 'Ānaya' is meant the activity of bringing This is apprehended, then, by synthesizing the meanings of these words, the synthetic meaning of the whole sentence, viz, the activity of bringing of an object known as cow [gokarmakam ānayanam]

Following the 'Abhihitānvaya' theory, the Naiyāyikas and Ālamkārikas explain the definition of sentence as follows .— Sentence is a combination of the meanings of words which possess consistency, expectancy and contiguity'[2]. A group of

1 तच्च पुनर्द्विविधम्– सिद्धार्थं विधायक चेति । विधायकमपि द्विविधम्– उपदेशकमतिदेशक च। इत्थमिद कर्तव्यमित्युपदेशः ।
SD, p 72

2 वाक्य स्याद्योग्यताऽकाक्षाऽऽसत्तियुक्त. पदोच्चयः ।
Sāhitya Darpana, II, st. 1

letters with a suffix [sup or tin] constitutes a word[1] The co ordinator of the meaning of a word with that of another is called consistency Consistency consists in a word not bearing a meaning which is incompatible with the meanings of other words in speech For instance, no verbal knowledge is derived from such a satement as 'sprinkling with fire', because it is incompatible wi'h fire being an instrument in the act of sprinkling

That without which a word can not produce knowledge of syntactical connection is called expectancy. A word is said to bear the relation of expectancy to another word if it cannot without the latter, produce knowledge of its interconncetion in speech For instance, 'Devadatta goes to the village' is a statement in which the word Devadattah [in the nominative case] is expectant for the word goes [the verb], and this latter in its turn is expectant for 'h', the crude word grāmam [the accusative case ending] and go [the root] for 'ti' [the verbal suffix] A crude word and a case suffix, a root and a verbal suffix and a verb and a case are expectants for each other The juxtaposition of words is called contiguity. Contiguity consists in the enunciation of words, without a long pause between them For instance, the sentence 'close the door' will convey no meaning if one utters the word 'close' now and the word 'the door' after an hour

Meaning of a sentence is called verbal judgement [śābdabodha] in śāstric technical terms The Mīmāmsā view about it is that only a determinate judgement [savikalpa-jñāna] is embodied in and conveyed by a proposition , every proposition comprises atleast a subject and a predicate ' in a verbal judgement arising in the hearer's mind from a proposition, the will to do [kṛti] denoted by the ending of the finite verb plays the role of the leading eoncept and all the other concepts are directly or indirectly subordinated to it , the cognition arising from a proposition is always non perceptual ; and the meanings of the words conveyed by the words respectively but the mean-

1 वर्णा पद प्रयोगार्हानन्वितैकार्थबोधका ।
Sāhitya Darpana, II, st 2

ing of the whole sentence is conveyed through the implication [laksanā], not through the particular juxtaposition of words [samsarga-maryādā]

The meaning of the word will be known through the significative force [Śabdavṛtti] It is the relation of a word and the object meant by that word which is always favourable in reviving the memory of that object It is of three kinds, viz, the denotation [abhidhā], the implication [laksaṇā], and the figurative expression [gauni]

Denotative function is the relation of a word to its meaning According to the old-logicians, it is of the form of a divine will that such and such a word should denote such and such a thing The neo logicians, however, maintain that it is not the divine will that constitutes denotative function, but any will The Bhāṭṭas say that the relation between words and their denotation is neither the divine will nor any other's will It is eternal without beginning or end[1]

The knowledge of it, however, is derived from grammar, comparison, dictionary, statement of trustworthy persons, usage of elders, supplementary statement, paraphrage and contiguity of well known words[2]

The usage of elders is prime means to understand the meaning of a word When the first elder commands the second elder to bring a cow, the second elder goes out and brings a cow The boy, who observes all this, concludes that the act of bringing the cow is the result of the knowledge that preceds the action The knowledge that prompted the second elder to the activity of bringing the cow arises only on the hearing of the command from the first elder because in the absence of such a command no activity was observed

Regarding this the Bauddhas say that denotative function is with regard to distinction of all other objects from it [apoha]

1 SD, pp. 90-97

2 शक्तिग्रह व्याकरणोपमानकोशाप्तवाक्याद्व्यवहारतश्च ।
वाक्यस्य शेषाद्विवृतेर्वदन्ति सान्निध्यत· सिद्धपदस्य वृद्धा· ।
Muktāvalı on Kārikāvaıı, p. 550

When we hear a word such as 'pot', [they argue]; we do not understand an external object, because we never really know external objects; nor the generic-attribute, because the genus is nothing more than a mere conception formed by our mind and imposed upon what we call external objects What the word pot then really signifies is that a certain thing possesses some pecularities which distinguish it from all other things We never know what is pot or potness, we only know what is not, viz, that it is neither a cloth nor a wall We have therefore only a negative knowledge of things and consequently the import of words must also be negative

According to the old logicians words denote individual things qualified by the generic-attribute [jāti-viśiṣṭa-vyakti] Their argument is as follows — when one says the sentence, 'bring a jar', the speaker does not desire the distinction of all other different objects from it, but the thing, jar, which possesses the class-notion, jarness, to be brought to him

But according to the neo-logicians, words denote only things individual When one says the word 'bring a jar', the speaker undoubtedly desires the thing, jar, and not the class-notion, jarness, to be brought to him The individual 'jar' must somehow or other be implied, otherwise the hearer can never bring the object Relying on this simple fact they say that the word, 'jar' primarily denotes the thing in individual, 'jar' The capacity of being the subject of any act [arthakriyā-kāritva] resides in the concrete object alone and hence it is the thing in individual on which the significance is made.

Regarding this the Mīmāṁsakas say that the potentiality in the word 'cow' signifies the generic-attribute 'cowness [which is common to all the cows] If the word were to mean an individual then it must have as many pontentialities as there are individuals meant by that word and without the knowledge of the class-attribute the apprehension of an individual is impossible. Thus the primary meaning of a word is with regard to the class-attribute and the apprehension of the individuals takes place subsequently by presumption [arthāpatti] For instance, the sentence, 'a man with a stick' [daṇḍī puruṣah]. It is well-known that without the prior knowledge of the attri-

bute, the knowledge of the individual as determined by that attribute is impossible Unless one has the knowledge of stick, one can not arrive at the knowledge, 'man with a stick' Similarly, the potentiality in the word 'cow' signifies only the genus and the individual is only by means of presumption

If the word denotes a particular, we could not explain such Vedic injunctions as 'The altar is to be built like a kite', as it would be impossible for altars to be made in every case like a particular kite Incapable of being so related, the word must be taken as denoting the generic-attribute

What possesses denotative function is the word It is of four kinds, viz derivative [yaugika], conventional [rūdha], derivatively-conventional [yaga-rūdha], and derivative cum conventional [yaugika-rūdha] Where only the meaning of the component part of a word is understood, it is derivative, e g Pācakah [cook] Where, irrespective of the denotative function of the component parts, a word is understood only through its collective denotative function it is called conventional, e g Gauh [cow] Where, however, in the object denoted by the denotative function of the component parts, a word, there is also collective denotative function, it is derivatively-conven, tional, e g 'Pankaja' [lotus] The word 'pankaja' conveys, by the denotative function of its component parts, the idea of some thing that grows in mud And by its collective denotative function it conveys the idea of a lotus Where the derivative and the conventional meanings are conveyed independently of each other, there the word is both derivative and conventional, e g Udbhid [a plant or a type of sacrifice] Here the meaning conveyed is both what shoots up, such as trees and shrubs, and also a name of sacrifice

The denotation [abhidhā] will explain only the meaning of a word not the meaning of a sentence. That [meaning of sentence] will be known through a implication [laksaṇā][1] only. The figurative description is based upon certain qualities It is conveyed through the third significative power of words, i e Gauṇī For instance, when the term 'lion' is applied to some

1 अभिधेयाविनाभूतप्रवृत्तिर्लक्षणेष्यते । TV, 1.-4.-12.

other being, say a man, what is understood is that the man is having courageous action, [the quality of the lion] denoted by the word lion) Hence, it is that when a person thinks of speaking of some one as having courageous action, the intention is fulfilled, if the term lion is used for that purpose, and what happens is that the animal lion, which is denoted by the word lion, on being cognised, brings about the notion of courageous action, which is associated with that animal. In this manner, by denoting its own meaning, the word (lion) brings about the notion of the presence of the qualities associated with that meaning[1] The Ālamkārikas include it under implication only[2]

The Ālamkārikas ascribe to the Mimāṁsakas that they accept intention [tātparya] as the fourth significative force of words,[3] but we do not find such discussion neither in the Bhatta texts nor in the Prābhākara texts and the both, the Bhāṭṭas and Prābhākaras, accept it as a fourth requisite in order to convey the meaning of the word. Their argument is — if the apprehension of the intention were not a cause of verbal comprehen sion, then a sentence like 'bring Saindhava', would not sometimes signify a Sindh horse and sometimes salt. It can not be he argued that the context and the like which help the appre-ension of the intention might as well be causes of verbal comprehension for they cannot be grouped under a common deno-bmination If, however, they are so grouped, as producing an apprehension of the intention, then, for the sake of simplicity, let the apprehension of the intention it self be the cause Thus, even in the Vedas the potentiality of the speech itself consists of an idea of the form, 'this speech directs me to perform or to desist from performing the act signified by it'[4]

1 लक्ष्यमाणगुणैर्योगाद् वृत्तेरिष्टा तु गौणता । TV, 1-4-23.
तत्सिद्धि–जाति–सारूप्य–प्रशसा–भूमा–लिङ्गसमवाया । JS, 1-4-12.

2 सादृश्येतरसबन्धाश्शुद्धास्त्वास्सकला अपि ।
सादृश्यात्तु मता गौण्यस्तेन षोडशभेदत. ।
Sāhitya Darpana, II, st 9 10

3 तात्पर्यार्थोऽपि केषुचित् । Kāvyaprakāśa, II, st 1.

4 वेदे तु पुरुषाभावात् लिङादिनिष्ठ एव । M N P, p. 194.

PRĀBHĀKARA VIEW

Verbal testimony is the third of the means of right knowledge accepted by the Prābhākaras Śālikanātha defines verbal testimony as follows 'Verbal testimony is that which is not cognised by any other means of right knowledge and proceeds from mind-soul contact aided by the knowledge of words' [Śabdavijñānāpekṣād ātma-manassannikarṣād yad adṛṣṭārtha-viṣayam vijñānam tat Śāstram nāma pramāṇam][1].

The Prābhākaras say that words both the human and the scriptural, conveys a complete idea if it is related to any action [kriyā], i e if any thing already known in our wordly experience is conveyed by the words in a sentence, that sentence cannot be called a means of verbal testimony Only that is a means of verbal testimony which conveys a new idea of valid character So, according to the Prābhākara, the Vedic injunctions alone are means of verbal testimony

Prabhākara maintains that Vedic injunctions are held to denote sacrifices such as yāga and others as duty or kārya for the persons Svarga-kāma and the rest Here arises a discripancy The Yāga can not be prescribed as duty or kārya to him who is Svarga-kāma unless it is capable of producing the Svarga desired by him Being a temporary action, it cannot produce Svarga as it does not last till one obtains Svarga. It is necessary, therefore, to accept some thing called Apūrva[2] as the outcome of the yāga to exist till the Svarga is attained Vedic Injunctions denote this Apūrva as kārya or duty to the Svargakāma, and not the action conveyed by the verb in that sentence as is the case in the non Vedic sentences This Āpūrva is also called as niyoga because the svargakāma is asked to perform it.

The words used in our everday conversation are not necessarily conveying new, unknown ideas, hence they are not means of verbal testimony. We do not see much difference

1 शास्त्र शब्दविज्ञानाद्यदसन्निकृष्टार्थविज्ञानम् । PP, p. 229

2 Rjuvimala, 1-1-25.

between the Prābhākaras and the Vaiśeṣikas regarding the human verbal testimony They both reduce it to inference Hence Śālikanātha says that the validity of human speech can always be doubted as the mere hearing of a sentence can never yield right knowledge In the case of a person who is known to speak only after having had a perceptual knowledge the spoken sentence is invariably accompanied by a prior perceptual knowledge That is why that sentence becomes probans for inferring that perceptual knowledge Thus human speech, in so far as it is a mere translator of some other knowledge, can not be classed under the means of verbal testimony[1]

A group of letters with a suffix [sup or tiṅ] constitutes a word A group of words having expectancy, compatibility and proximity constitutes a sentence Expectancy is the desire to know Compatibility is the non-existence of conflict with any means of right knowledge Proximity is the continuous utterence of words[2]

In every word there are a number of letters When the second letter is uttered the first passes out of cognition and all the letters are not presented to our cognition simultaneously, i e in a single moment we do not cognize all those letters together How then is it possible for us to perceive the word as a whole ? Prabhākara's contention is that the last letter in contact with the sense of hearing gives rise to the word-cognition The sense of hearing is aided by two factors : impressions generated by the previous letters and apprehension of the previous letters[3].

According to the Prābhākara there is no separate sentence meaning apart from the word meanings put together It is true that a sentence contains not only word meanings but also their

1 पूर्वं तु लिङ्गभूत तत् वक्तुर्ज्ञानावधारणे ।
वक्तृज्ञानप्रसिद्ध हि वाक्य तत्कार्यमिष्यते ॥
कार्यात्कारणसिद्धिश्च सर्वेषामनुमानत ।
पौरुषेयमतो वाक्य न शास्त्रमभिधीयते ॥ PP, p. 37.

2 Bṛhatī, p 63 , Ṛjuvimalā, p 135.

3 Bṛhatī, PP 160-161.

syntactical relation with other words and its own meaning[1]

The verb is the principal word in a proposition because it is the verb that forms the copula as it were to connect a number of words into a sentence If one only says 'Devadatta the village' we can make nothing out of those words; they are disconnected But as soon as the verb 'goes' is added, the whole forms a connected proposition conveying the idea of Devadatta's motion to the village The idea of motion is the chief significance of the sentence, the words 'Devadatta' and 'village' simply serve to specify and define as it were that motion The verb 'goes' denotes motion in general, the addition of Devadatta limits the sense to the motion of a particular individual, while the further addition of the village still more restricts this limited motion of an individual to one in a particular direction and towards a particular place Here the verb is principal and other two expressions simply act as limiting qualifications

Every word in a sentence conveys the meaning connected with the meaning of the other words in the sentence in a syntactic manner Thus, when a boy hears the sentence 'bring a cow' the syntactic meaning of the whole sentence is first apprehended by the observance of the usage of elders It is only after this that the boy tries to know the meanings of particular words through the process of insertion [āvāpa] and deletion [uddhāra][2] This theory is known as Anvitābhidhāna-vāda

According to the Prābhākara, a word does not convey meaning unless the word meaning relation is learnt, and this relation is learnt from the usage of elderly persons. The elderly persons resort to word usage by employing sentences rather than single words Hence what is learnt is the relation between a sentence and its meaning And what is a sentence ?

1 पदैरेवाऽन्वितस्वार्थमात्रोपक्षीणशक्तिभि. ।
स्वार्थश्चेद्बोधिता बुद्धो वाक्यार्थोऽपि तथा सति ॥ PP, p. 377.

2 व्यवहारेषु वृद्धाना वाक्यश्रवणभाविषु ।
आवापोद्धारभेदेन पदाना शक्तिनिश्चय: ॥ ibid, p 378

A sentence is but words as combined together and thus conveying a meaning The words would not combine together to convey a meaning if that operation be possible on the part of one single word, just as fuel, etc ,— which constitute the causal aggregate of cooking— jointly undertake the operation called 'cooking', so also do all the words of a sentence jointly undertake the operation called 'conveying the sentential meaning'

The Prābhākara accepts the necessity of thus apprehending each word separately before combining them in a sentence[1], when the meaning of the whole sentence can as well be conveyed at once in the form of the collective sense of all the words , that is, according to the Prābhākara, the expressive power resides in the apprehended words and not in the apprehension itself and verbal knowledge is obtained from one word [such as, verb] but not from all the words together

Power is the relation of a word and an object, that always serves to revive the memory of that object [whenever the word is spoken] The Naiyāyika identifies it with the divine will that makes the convention The Bhātta accepts it as a quality The Prābhākara regards it as a separate category His argument is that power is not a substance as qualities inhere [in them] , it is also distinct from qualities and actions It resides in genus and other categories It must therefore be regarded as a seperate category[2]

The Bhātta and the Naiyāyika accept the word as of four kinds, viz , derivative, conventional, derivativily conventional and derivative-cum-conventional[3] And they give the word 'Pankaja' [lotus] as an example for the derivativily conventional Here the old-Naiyāyika holds that the word 'Pankaja' conveys, by the denotative function of its component parts, the idea of something that grows in the mud, and by its collective deno-

1 प्राथम्यादभिधातृत्वात् तात्पर्यावगमादपि ।
पदानामेव सा शक्ति · । ibid, p 400
2 न द्रव्य गुणवृत्तित्वाद् गुणकर्मबहि कृता ।
सामान्यादिषु सत्वेन सिद्धभावान्तर हि सा ॥
3 See supra, p 59.

tative function it conveys the idea of a lotus as a lotus But the neo-Naiyāyika speaks that the lotus, which is known from the collective denotative function, is joined, through contiguity, the meaning of the component parts, viz , what grows in mud Where, however, the conventional meaning is known to be contradicted, there the 'water lily', etc, are understood by implication. And where the intended meaning is not a water-lily as such, and at the same time the idea of a lotus as such is contradicted, there verbal comprehension [of the water-lily] takes place simply by the denotative function of the component parts of the word Where, however, as in the case of a 'land lotus', the meaning of the component parts is contradicted, there the meaning conveyed by collective denotative function is a lotus If, on the other hand, the land lotus is held to belong to a different species altogether, then the meaning is obtained by implication alone

The Prābhākara does not accept convention [rūdhi] and they say in Pankaja, etc there is no convention, because its application to the lotus is intelligible even through the significance of the parts Its non-application to the lity, etc , may, however, be due to its mere non-usage with reference to them According to the Prābhākara, the word is of one kind, viz , derivative

The Prābhākara, like the Bhātta[1], accepts intention [tātparya] as a fourth requisite, in order to convey the meaning of the word, and not as a fourth significative force of the words as put fourth by the rhetoricians Intention is essential to have a correct understanding of the sentence For instance, 'Protect the curd from crows'[2], implies that all birds and creatures must be kept off the curd Here the word 'crows' is only a suggestion implying every other bird and creature from which the curd is to be protected

In some places the intention of the speaker is understood by supplying a particular idea to make the meaning sensible,

1 See supra, p. 60

2 काकेभ्यो दधि रक्षताम् ।

e g when one says 'door', the idea of 'closing' must be supplied to get at the exact intention of the speaker, because the meaning of the sentence springs from the consistency among the words in the sentence[1] If the idea of 'closing' is not supplied to the word 'door' to complete the sentence, there will be the absence of consistency between the words in the sentence Consequently the intention of the speaker to close the door will not be clear Regarding this, the Bhāṭṭa says that if one says only 'door' then another word 'close' along with the idea of closing must be supplied to get at the exact intention of the speaker We may see here that the Prābhākara view is better than that of the Bhāṭṭa, because the latter view is sublated by the defect of following a difficult method when an easy one is available [laghūpāye sati gurvāśrayaḥ].

ANALOGY

Analogy [upamāna] has been treated as an independent means of right knowledge by the Naiyāyika and the Mīmāmsaka. The Buddhist rejects it as an independent means of right knowledge and holds it to be a case of perception or inference, since the knowledge arising out of it can be acquired through either perception or inference. The Vaiśesika also rejects it as an independent means of right knowledge, and includes it under inference. Among Naiyāyikas Bhāsarvajña, however, follows the Vaiśeṣika view.

Even though the Naiyāyika and the Mīmāṁsaka accept it as an independent means of right knowledge, there is considerable difference between the concepts of analogy established by them According to the Naiyāyika, analogy [that is, knowledge resulting from the employment of similarity[2]] has for its object the denotative relation between a word or a name standing for a strange object and the strange object itself, on the

1 एकपदप्रयोगे हि द्वारमित्यादावभिधानमेव । PP, p 386.

2 प्रसिद्धसाधर्म्यात् साध्यसाधनमुपमानम् । ND, 1-1 6

ground of the resemblance of that strange object to an already familiar one This may be illustrated as follows — Let us suppose that a person, who very well knows the cow, is told by another person that there is a kind of animal living in the forest which resembles the cow and is called Gavaya He then happens to go to the forest and perceives an animal which is hither to unknown to him, but which resembles the cow Thereupon he comes to remember what he was told before, namely, that the Gavaya resembles the cow And, as a result, he acquires the knowledge that Gavaya is the name of the strange animal concerned Thus, the relation between a word and its denotation cannot be grasped, through perception, etc , but only through analogy[1]

The Naiyāyika further explains it as of three kinds, 1) the analogy through similarity [sādharmyopamāna], 2) the analogy through dissimilarity [vaidharmyopamāna], and 3) the analogy through common characteristics [dharmamātropamāna] The analogy through similarity is the means of cognising some unknown object through its similarity to a well-known object, e g say, a person happens to be ignorant of the meaning of the word 'Gavaya' From a forester, he learns that a Gavaya is similar to a cow , he goes to a forest, sees the animal, which is similar to a cow and recollects the information conveyed by the assimilative proposition Then the assimilative knowledge ' This is the animal denoted by the word 'Gavaya' arises

Analogy through dissimilarity is the means of cognising some unknown object through its dissimilarity to a well-known object, e g say, a person happens to be ignorant of the meaning of the word ' horse' From a freind, he learns that a horse has not a cloven hoof like a cow, he sees the animal with a single hoof and recollects the information conveyed by the dissimilative proposition. Then the dissimilative knowledge ' This is the animal denoted by the word 'horse' arises.

1 कीदृग्गवय इत्येव पृष्टो नागरिकैर्यंदि ।
ब्रवीत्यारण्यको वाक्य यथा गौर्गवयस्तथा ॥ SV, UPa st 1

Analogy through characteristics-in-general is the means of cognising some unknown object through the statement of characteristics-in-general, e.g. 'A camel has a long neck and drooping lips, and eats thorns', after hearing this, one can know a camel elsewhere [1]

Kumārila Bhaṭṭa criticises the Naiyāyika view on the ground that as the knowledge of denotative relation is supposed to issue from perception of similarity, it can very well be a case of perception[2] He further explains that the element of remembrance is not a valid piece of knowledge[3] What induces to the knowledge of denotative relation is the sense-object contact only This may be explained thus After hearing the sentence, 'the merchant has Nava (nine or new) blankets' [Nava kambalī vaṇik], one goes to the market and, seeing nine blankets with the merchant, concludes that the purport is a particular number, and understands the meaning of the sentence Similarly, a person who is ignorant of the object denoted by the word 'Gavaya' learns from a forester that Gavaya is similar to a cow Subsequently, going to the forest, he sees the strange animal similar to a cow, gets back memory, and attains the expressed meaning of the word 'Gavaya' cognized through perception. Therefore the apprehension of the relation, between a name and the object denoted by it, is even possible through words assisted by perception, and so there is no need to seek a distinct means of knowledge Thus criticising the Naiyāyika view, the Mīmāṁsaka accepts analogy as the knowledge of similarity present in the cow, for which there is no other means

Śabarasvāmin defines analogy as follows 'Analogy is that which consists of similarity also brings about the cognition of things not in contact with the senses' [Upamānam api

1 एतत्साधर्म्यवाक्यार्थादुपमान समीरितम् ।
एवमेव हि वैधर्म्यात् धर्ममात्राच्च सम्भवेत् ॥ MM p 115

2 यावद्धीन्द्रियसम्बद्धे तत्प्रत्यक्षमिति स्मृतम् । SV, L Pp st 9

3 स्मर्यमाणस्य चांशस्य विवेके नाप्रमाणता । ibid, Upa, st 10

sādṛśyam asannikṛṣṭe arthe buddhim utpādayati][1] Further he explains it with the help of example 'just as the perception of Gavaya is the cause of remembrance of the cow' [yathā gavaya darśanam gosmaraṇasya] The compound 'gavaya-darśanam' is a Bahuvrīhi. The word 'darśanam' is to be interpreted as — that in which (similarity) is experienced [dṛśyate asmin iti] So the total meaning of the compound will be the similarity that is experienced in Gavaya The compound 'gosmaranasya' means the agent who recollects the cow The word 'smaraṇam' is to be taken in the sense of the agent who recollects. So the total meaning will be— The similarity experienced in Gavaya produces a knowledge 'the cow is similar to this [Gavaya]' According to the Bhāśyakāra, the result of analogy is right knowledge of the object not in contact with the senses In the stock example the result is the remembrance of a cow Here the object of remembrance is, no doubt, not in contact with the senses, but it is not a valid knowledge Hence, this illustration of the Bhāśyakāra is rejected by Kumārila[2] and Śālikanātha[3]

Pārthasārathi says that analogy consists in viewing an object — observed earlier and recalled now as similar to another object that is under observation now Thus when on seeing a Gavaya's similarity with a cow a man comments that the cow earlier seen by him in the town is similar to this Gavaya, it is only because this man is taking recourse to analogy[4]

The psychological process involves four steps First of all there is the knowledge or perception of points of similarity in the Gavaya Secondly, through similarity, is revived the memory of the cow seen earlier in the village Thirdly, there arises the knowledge that the perceptible Gavaya is like the

1 सदृशादुपजायेत या मतिस्सदृशान्तरे ।
ध्यानाविस्मृतितुल्यत्वात्सा नराणा कथ भवेत् ॥ SV, Upa st 4

2 गोस्मरणस्येति भाष्यप्रयुक्तम् । न हि... PP, p. 107

3 SBh, 1-1-5, p. 37

4 पूर्वदृष्टे स्मर्यमाणेऽर्थे दृश्यमानोर्थसादृश्यज्ञानमुपमानम् । SD, p 74

cow and, lastly, there is the consequent knowledge that the cow seen earlier is similar to the Gavaya seen at present, or, in other words, the cow seen is qualified by the similarity to the Gavaya seen at present.

This is not a case of perception, because the cow [which is the object of the resulting knowledge] does not here come in contact with the cogniser's senses Nor is it a case of remembrance [the remembrance is the result of the past impressions], because the Gavaya and consequently it's similarity to cow was not perceived earlier to the perception of the Gavaya Even though we find the element of remembrance in analogy, still it can not be reduced to remembrance In the above mentioned example, the similarity is perceived and the cow is remembered yet the combination of the two, i e, the remembered cow as qualified by its similarity to the Gavaya and its similarity, is not known through remembrance[1]

Nor is it a case of inference For one might suppose that man is inferring as 'The cow must be similar to Gavaya, because the Gavaya is similar to cow' But this supposition will be illegitimate in as much as the type of knowledge we are describing can possibly be acquired even by a man who has not seen a cow and a Gavaya together, but has seen a cow earlier in the town and is seeing a Gavaya now in the forest Thus if on seeing the Gavaya's similarity with cow this man finds it possible to have knowledge to the effect that the cow earlier seen by him in the town is similar to this Gavaya This is because he has taken recourse to an altogether new means of right knowledge, called analogy[2].

The sole purpose of analogy is that it serves the purpose of replacing one object with the other similar to it in the context of the sacrificial details in case of a rite of which the details are not mentioned but are to be taken from some other rite The Vrīhis taken for a Purodāśa of a sacrifice are defiled or

1 प्रत्यक्षो गवयस्तावत् सादृश्यस्मृतिरत्र तु ।
ननु सादृश्ययुक्तेऽर्थे न स्मृतिर्नेन्द्रियाद्गति. ॥ SV, Upa, st. 7

2 SD, p. 76

lost, Nīvāra can be taken as a substitute of Vrīhi with a view that the grain will be the same This is, because the Nīvāra is similar to the Vrīhi[1]. Similarly, where the details of procedure are not described, there they can be known through the means of analogy, e g. the Saurya sacrifice is an ectype [vikṛti] sacrifice, here the sacrificial details are not described. Through the similarity of divinity, the details can be borrowed from the archetype [Prakṛti] sacrifice, viz Āgneya sacrifice

Regarding the similarity of divinity, Dr Govardhan P Bhat has made some remarks as follows: 'The Saurya sacrifice is similar to the Āgneya sacrifice in the respect that both have a common deity[2]'. But the Saurya and the Āgneya sacrifices do not have a common deity The Saurya sacrifice was described with the injunction, 'one desiring Brāhmic glory, should offer cooked rice dedicated to Sūrya' [Sauryam carum nirvapet brahma-varcasa-kāmaḥ] with the deity of Sūrya The Āgneya sacrifice was described with the injunction 'one should offer puroḍāśa [baked on eight potsherds] to Agni' [yad āgneya aṣṭākapālo bhavati] with the deity of Agni Here the Saurya and the Āgneya sacrifices have different deities not a common deity The similarity of divinity here is that the both sacrifices have a single deity The Āgneya has a single deity, viz , Agni. The Saurya also has a single deity, viz., Sūrya Due to this similarity of divinity, the sacrificial details of the Āgneya sacrifice can be transferred into the Saurya sacrifice through the means of analogy

PRĀBHĀKARA VIEW

The Prābhākara criticises the Naiyāyika view on the ground that the Naiyāyika does not explain the nature of analogy as a distinct means of right knowledge. In the stock example of

1 प्रतिनिधिरपि चैव व्रीहिसादृश्ययोगाद्-
भवति तदपचारे यत्र नीवारजातौ ॥ SV, Upa, st. 53

2 Epistemology of the Bhāṭṭa school of Pūrvamīmāṃsā, p. 307

the Naiyāyika, the first knowledge that the Gavaya is similar to the cow arises through the authoritative statement and is not the result of analogy The knowledge of Gavaya and its similarity to the cow arising in the man who has gone to the forest, are recognition and perception[1].

Respectively, the understanding that this object is denoted by the word 'Gavaya' is the inferential knowledge When a word is used in certain meaning, one comes to know the denotative relation with the object After requiring the knowledge of the denotative relation in the forest, the final knowledge 'the name known to me is of that animal only' is the case of remembrance Thus, there is no scope for analogy It is also argued that the Naiyāyika's concept of analogy can be reduced to the inference The Prābhākara puts the syllogism like this · 'the word Gavaya denotes the animal Gavaya, because it is used in the latter sense by learned man When there is no function other than direct denotation, a term used by the learned man in the sense of particular object is regarded as denoting that object, just as the term cow' The term Gavaya is used in the sense of an object which is similar to a cow Therefore, it should be accepted as denoting the animal Gavaya[2].

Prabhākara defines analogy as follows 'Analogy is that which brings about the knowledge of another thing (cow) which is not in contact with the senses[3], but which bears similarity to the thing [Gavaya] which has contact with the senses'[3] Śālikanātha's definition is as follows 'Analogy is the knowledge of what is not in contact with the senses, arising from the similarity to an object that is seen'[4] [sādṛśyad dṛśyamānād

1 यदपि वन गतस्य गवये, तद्गते च गोसादृश्ये ज्ञानम् , तदपि प्रत्यभिज्ञाप्रत्यक्षम् । PP, p 271

2 या त्वेतस्य गवयशब्दवाच्यतावगतिः, साऽपि गवयशब्दप्रयोगादनुमानिकी । यस्य शब्दस्य ... ibid, p. 271

3 Bṛhatī, p. 107

4 Ṛjuvimala, p 109, सादृश्यदर्शनोत्थ ज्ञान सादृश्यविषयमुपमानम् । PP, p. 267

yat pratıyogını jāyate, Sādṛśya-vısayaṁ Jñānam upamānaṁ tad ucyate]

Prabhākara, lıke Kumārıla, establıshes the ındependent posıtıon of analogy The knowledge of the cow qualıfied by ıts sımılarıty to the Gavaya can not be a case of perception, because the knowledge pertaıns to some thıng not ın contact wıth the senses Nor ıt ıs a case of mere remembrance, because at the tıme that the cow was seen ın the past, the Gavaya had not been seen, and what has not been seen can not be remembred Nor ıt ıs a case of ınference also, because what brıngs about an ınference ıs an ınvarıable concomıtance [vyāptı] that has been perceıved several tımes The analogy does not possess the relatıonshıp whıch ıs essentıal ın an ınference[1]

The Prābhākara establıshes sımılarıty [sādrśya] as a dıstınct category and says that the sımılarıty can not be a substance [dravya], because ıt ıs found ın the case of the qualıty [guṇa] and actıon [karma] as well It ıs neıther qualıty nor actıon, sınce ıt ıs found wıth ıeference to the qualıty and actıon also It ıs not the case of commonness Hence ıt ıs not genes [jātı] also It can not be ıncluded ın ınherence [samavāya], because the sımılarıty ıs of the form of relatıon The partıcularıty [vıśesa] ıs not accepted even by the all Naıyāyıkas So, thereıs no questıon of ıncludıng ıt in that. Hence it should be accepted as a dıstınct category[2]

The Bhātta and the Prābhākara both crıtıcıse the Naıyāyıka's concept of analogy on same arguments The Bhāṭṭa includes the analogy of the Naıyāyıka ın perceptıon, but the Prābhākara ıncludes ıt ın ınference They both establısh ıt as an ındependent means of rıght knowledge on the basıs of Śabarasvāmın's definıtıon, ı e Analogy ıs sımılarıty [expressed ın the object] generatıng a cognıtion (of the same) in another whıch has no contact wıth the senses [Upamānam apı sādrśyam

1 किञ्च असकृद्दृष्टसम्बन्धो ह्यनुमानस्य हेतु, असजातीयव्यावृत्तिसव्यपेक्षश्च, द्वयमत्र नास्तीति प्रमाणान्तरम्। Bṛhati, p 108

2 सर्ववस्तूनि सविदेकशरणानि। अस्ति चेय सदृश इति सवित्। .. अत पदार्थान्तरमेवेदम् ... PP, p. 268

asannikrste arthe buddhim utpādayati]. Further the Bhāṣyakāra illustrates it with the example as follows the similarity experienced in Gavaya produces the knowledge 'the cow is similar to this [Gavaya]' [Yathā gavaya-darśanam go-smaranasya]

The difference in the two interpretations turns upon the meaning of the sentence 'Go-smaranasya'. Kumārila interprets the sentence as 'Go-smaranasya buddhim utpādayati—' i e the similitude produces the idea of the remembrance of the cow Prabhākara interprets it as 'Anubhūtagoh puruṣasya' 'to the man who had known the cow' However, there is no fundamental difference regarding analogy in both the schools, but only a minor difference, viz , that the Prābhākara considers similarity to be an independent category, while the Bhāṭṭa considers it as the assemblage of common features[1]

PRESUMPTION

The word 'Arthāpatti' (presumption) stands for both the meanings, viz , the means of knowledge and the resulting knowledge The etymology of the word 'Arthāpatti' in the sense of the means is explained as 'Arthasya āpattih yasmāt' the knowledge of the fact which has to be accounted for and is otherwise unaccountable — the knowledge through which the needed explanatory fact is presumptively arrived at In the sense of the resulting knowledge, the same word is explained as 'Arthasya āpattih' the presumptive knowledge of the required explanatory circumstance

Śabarasvāmin defines presumption as follows · 'The assumption of some thing not perceived when what is seen or heard would not be possible without the assumption. The assumption is called as presumption' [Arthāpattirapi drstah śruto vā arthaḥ anyathā nopapadyata ityarthakalpanā][2] Further

1 भूयोऽवयवसामान्ययोगो जात्यन्तरस्य तत् । SV, Upa, st 18

2 SBh, 1-1-5, p. 38

he illustrates it with the example It is found that Devadatta who is alive is not in his house leads to the assumption that he is somewhere outside the home[1] From this statement it is not clear whether Śabarasvāmin means presumption of two forms, viz , 1) presumption from what is seen [drstārthāpatti] and 2) presumption from what is heard [śrutārthāpatti], or a single form of it, because he mentions two words drsta (seen) and śruta (heard) as the upapādya (the fact requiring explanation) which appears to refer to two forms of presumption But he illustrates through example only one, viz , presumption from what is seen, and not two

The Bhāṭṭa, following Śabarasvāmin's definition of presumption, establishes two kinds of presumption While the Prābhākara, following Śabarasvāmin's illustration of presumption, establishes single form of presumption In this connection Dr Govardhan P Bhat makes some remarks as follows · 'Śabara has given only one example of presumption, but in case he intended two forms of presumption, he should have given two instead of one'[2] This hypothesis, however, is against the well settled fact[3] and his argument is sublated by the fallacy of Satpratipakṣa It occurs when there are two probans leading to conflitcting inferences and there is no decision as to which of the two is the real one Here we have two arguments — 1) 'Śabarasvāmin intended two forms of presumption, because he has used the two words, 'seen' and 'heard' as upapādya in his definition, which refer to two forms of presumption' and 2) 'Śabarasvāmin intended one form of presumption, because he has given one example of presumption', both the arguments lead to conflicting inferences And they appear to be equally cogent and it is difficult to determine whether Śabarasvāmin intended two forms of presumption or one form of presumption

1 यथा जीवतो देवदत्तस्य गृहाभावदर्शने बहिर्भावस्यादृष्टस्य परिकल्पना । ibid, p 38

2 Epistemology of the Bhāṭṭa school of PM, p 315

3 दृष्टश्रुतभेदेनाऽर्थापत्तेः द्वैविध्य शबरमुनिनाऽङ्गीक्रियते स्म । Viṣama Sthala Tippaṇī on PP, p 278

BHĀṬṬA VIEW

Kumārila defines presumption as follows · 'When a fact ascertained by any of the six means of right knowledge is found to be inaplicable except on the basis of a fact not so ascertained, the assumpption of this latter fact is presumption '[1] For instance — If we know that Devadatta is alive (through inference) and at the same time find that he does not exist at home (through non-apprehension), there arises a conflict between his being alive and his being absent from home which can not be resolved except on the assumption that he lives outside his home

The Naiyāyika seeks to show that presumption is indistinguishable from inference [2] For instance, where aliveness is known to be a concomitant of one or the other of two alternatives, viz being outside or being at home, there one of the two must be held be true , and existence at home being contradicted by perception, existence outside is presented by inference[2] Against the Naiyāyika view the Bhāṭṭa argues that it is impossible to conceive of mere living without some specification Before apprehending his being outside, it is not possible to think conjointly of his being alive and his not being at home Since there is no knowledge of the probans in the form of his not being at home as equalled by his being alive, we cannot infer his existence outside' Therefore, presumption is certainly distinct from inference

Regarding this the Prābhākara says that when we find that Devadatta, who was generally found to be exist in his home, is not in his home we become doubtful whether he is alive or dead This doubt will be removed through presumption by assuming that Devadatta exists outside his home This is not a case of inferring 'Devadatta's existence outside his home'

1 प्रमाणषट्कविज्ञातो यत्रार्थो नान्यथा भवेत् ।
अदृष्टं कल्पयेदन्यं सार्थापत्तिरुदाहृता ॥ SV, Artha, st. 1
2 अर्थापत्तिस्तु नैवेह प्रमाणान्तरमिष्यते ।
व्यतिरेकव्याप्तिबुद्ध्या चरितार्था हि सा यतः ॥ KV, st. 144

from 'Devadatta's non-existence at home' For the latter can also be due to 'Devadatta's death'

Pārthasārathi criticises the Prābhākara view on the ground that a mere knowledge that Devadatta does not exist in his home, nor a mere knowledge that Devadatta is not dead, will lead to the knowledge that Devadatta is existing outside his home. But these two knowledges taken together do lead to this third knowledge being inferred from the first two For, here the third ensues as soon as the first two are heard While in an inference the conclusion does not ensue as soon as the probans is observed, and that is because the recollection of invariable concomitance between the probans and the probandum is the other indispensable condition of arriving at conclusion there [1]

What actually happens is that the knowledge that Devadatta is not dead and the knowledge that he does not exist at home are contradictory of each other While their contradiction is resolved by our having the knowledge that he is existing outside home For, to say that Devadatta is alive and yet not exists at home without the same time positing that he is existing outside home amounts to saying that Devadatta who is not existing at home, exists either at home or outside it But that is not possible, for a thing cannot be both existing and absent at the same place Thus the general characteristics of the case of presumption is that here we come to have two knowledges which are inconsistent of each other, while this inconsistency remains unresolved unless a third knowledge is assumed through presumption Hence presumption is distinct

Those, who hold that inference can be included in presumption argue thus. Suppose we have the knowledge that whatever has smoke has fire and the knowledge that a particular hill has smoke Now in this case if the hill does not have fire either the knowledge that this hill has smoke or the knowledge that whatever has smoke has fire, will be wrong so that both these knowledges are renderd valid by our

1 SD, pp. 76-79

positing that the hill has fire And all that turns this to be a case of presumption

To the above argument Pārthasārathi answers — This contingency will arise only in case while inferring fire on the hill, we already somehow happen to know through some means of right knowledge other than inference that whatever (i e whatever particular place) has smoke has fire But that is not the case For here we only know that in such and such places smoke has been found to be accompanied by fire but not that whatever has smoke has fire It is inference which makes us to know that whatever has smoke has fire And certainly, one who has knowledge merely to be the effect that in such and such places smoke has been found to be concomitant with fire faces no inconsistency, to eliminate which one might be forced to posit knowledge to the effect that whatever has smoke has fire Hence it is that to infer the existence of fire at a place found to have smoke is not a case of presumption Hence inference is distinct [1]

As previously mentioned, the Bhāṭṭa recognizes two kinds of presumption 1) presumption from what is seen [dṛṣṭārthāpatti] and 2) presumption from what is heard [śrutār hāpatti], according to the fact being made out through some means of right knowledge other than verbal testimony or through verbal testimony Thus presumption from what is seen is of five kinds, viz , that based upon — perception, inference, analogy, another presumption, and upon non-apprehension

An example for the presumption based on perception is the assumption of the existence in fire of a power to burn, without which the perception of burning cannot be explained[2] For instance, fire in the immediate vicinity of a particular kind of gem, or of a particular herb, does not burn, but it does burn when it is free from that Here the conflict arises that how fire does not burn some time and does burn

1 ibid, p 79

2 तत्र प्रत्यक्षतो ज्ञाताद्दाहाद्दहनशक्तता । SV, Arthā, st. 3

some time? This conflict is resolved by only the assumption of burning power in fire Hence here it is inferred that the gem, etc, destroys that power of fire which helps combustion, whereas the presence of stimulating gem or the removal of the previous gem generates it From perception it is ascertained that fire burns things

An example for the presumption based on inference, from the fact that the sun is in different places at different times, it is inferred that he moves from place to place and it is assumed that the movement is not possible without possessing the power for movement Here the conflict arises how can the sun move from one place to another without having legs? This conflict is resolved by only the assumption of moving power in the sun.

An example for the presumption based on analogy: the assuming of the cognisability of the cow by the knowledge born of the similarity between the cow and the Gavaya Here the conflict arises how can the knowledge of the cow's similarity arise when one sees a Gavaya and not when one sees cow? This conflict is resolved by only the assumption of some power in the cow which is manifested by perception of the counter-correlative and gives rise to the knowledge of its similarity to the Gavaya

An example for the presumption based upon another presumption; the assumption of the eternity of the word We found in the knowledge of the denotative potency of the word through presumption based upon the well-known fact that it denotes certain things— and on the basis of the said presumed denotative potency,— which can not be possible without assuming eternity of the words.[1] The assumption of Devadatta's presence out side his home is at example for the presumption based on non-apprehension [2]

Where, however, in an incomplete sentence there is importation of words to make out the syntactical relation, if is

1 SV, Arthā, st. 4–9

2 See supra, p. 76.

called the presumption from what is heard. For instance, some one says, 'Door'. As the word by itself can not give full meaning, we complete the sentence by adding the word, say, 'close' This is we postulate what should have been uttered. And there, one proceeding to assume the sense of closing, etc, even along with a word, assumes only the word for the sake of economy [lāghava], since the sense can be understood from the word itself

The Prābhākara rejects presumption from what is heard as an independent division and includes it under presumption from what is seen Regarding the stock example, he says that what is to be assumed is only the sense of closing, there is no assumption of a word The Bhāṭṭa criticises the Prābhākara view on the ground that if the sense alone is assumed to complete the sentence, then in the Vedic sentence, 'I offer what is pleasing to the sun [Sūryāya juṣṭam nirvapāmi]' only the sense in the form of the sun has to be supplied, not the word, 'to the sun' [Sūryāya] But all are assuming here the word, 'to the sun' and not only the sense Hence presumption from what is heard is distinct from presumption form what is seen.

Kumārila says that presumption from what is heard is very essential for the interpretation of the Vedic texts, thus,— The validity of the injunctions in the codes [smṛtis] of Manu, etc, enjoining Astakā śrāddha and other rites is explained by only presumption from what is heard that they are based on Smṛti injunctions and not the ordinary statements of men which may or may not be authentic The word meaning [linga] of a hymn [mantra] to convey a particular sense becomes a proof on specification of auxiliary [angitva] on the basis of this presumption only The hymn 'I cut the straw, a seat for the gods' [barhir devasadanam dāmi] which explains the cutting of sacred grass [darbha] in the Fullmoon day and New moon day sacrifices will be of no use unless we take it as an accessory of cutting of sacred grass in the sacrifice : and this can not be made out by means of word-meaning [liṅga] unless we take for granted the Vedic sentence 'this hymn should be utilised as an auxiliary of cutting of sacred grass

in this sacrifice' The presumption of a Vedic sentence without which the means of word-meaning can not explain the relation of auxiliary and principal [aṅga-angibhāva] is the result of this presumption The supplying of the word expressing a fruit in those injunctions without special desired-end is again made possible by presumption from what is heard For instance, no fruit is directly stated in the injunction 'He shall sacrifice with the Viśvajit' [Viśvajitā yajeta], and since a fruit must infalliably be assumed because it is impossible that an injunction could be stated unless there were a fruit, it is assumed, through presumption from what is heard, that heaven is the fruit, because it is a universal object of desire[1]

PRĀBHĀKARA VIEW

As mentioned earlier, among the schools of Indian philosophy, only the Mīmāṁsā and the Vedānta accept presumption as independent means of right knowledge The admission of presumption is a necessity when there arises a contradiction between two well known facts followed by a demand for its resolution Hence Śabarasvāmin defines it as the assumption of unperceived fact apart from which the contradiction between two actually seen or heard facts can not be resolved [dṛṣtah śruto vārthaḥ anyathā nopapadyata ityarthakalpanā[2]]

According to Prabhākara, the expresson 'seen or heard' [drstah śrutah], in the definition, is an idiomatic one which is used in the sense of 'well known' through the means of right knowledge[3] But the Bhātta interprets the expression as two different words having separate meanings seen [drstah] means known through the means of perception or inference or analogy or presumption or non-apprehension, 'heard' [śrutah]

1 स्मृत्या स्मृतिर्या परिकल्प्यतेऽस्मिन् लिंगादिभिर्या विनियोजिका च ।
फलादिभिर्यत्परिपूरण च सम्बन्धदृक् तत्र न काचिदस्ति ॥
SV, Arthā,st 87

2 SBh, p 38

3 दृष्ट श्रुतो वा इत्युपलब्धेवाचिकम् । Brhatī, p 115

means known through the means of verbal testimony. And the Bhāṭṭa regards that the words refer to two kinds of presumption, viz, 1) presumption from what is seen and 2) presumption from what is heard But the Prābhākara rejects to accept two kinds of presumption and includes the latter one (presumption from what is heard) in the previous one (presumption from what is seen) Here, the expresson 'seen and heard' stands for 'known' through any means of right knowledge And in the stock example of presumption from what is seen of the Bhāṭṭa 'door', in order to get a syntactical relation, the Prābhākara assumes, through the means of presumption, only the sense of closing, not the word 'close' as accepted by the Bhāṭṭa

Prabhākara criticises the Naiyāyika view on the ground that in presumption the knowledge of something that provides the required explanation [upapādaka jñāna] is result [phala] and the knowledge of the fact to be explained [upapādya jñāna] is instrumental cause [karaṇa], while in inference the knowledge of something that provides the required explanation is instrumental cause and the knowledge of the fact to be explained is result And in inference the conclusion is drawn from the knowledge of invariable concomitance between the probans and the probandum, while in presumption there is no knowledge of such a relation[1] In the stock example, 'Devadatta who is alive is not at home', it is not the possible falsification of the knowledge of Devadatta being alive that constitutes the means of right knowledge, called presumption But it is the doubt regarding Devadatta being alive, which arises from the conflict, i e. Devadatta living and existing somewhere is an established fact through the means of inference and he does not exist at his home is also an established fact through the means of non-apprehension That serves as the means of the resultant knowledge which consists in the presumptive knowledge of Devadatta being outside his home.

1 यदि यच्चेन विना नोपपद्यते तदेवावगमकं स्यात् । इह तु यन्नोपपद्यते तदेवावगम्यते । किं चात्र नोपपद्यते ··· ···ibid p. 112

Sālikanātha says that presumption involves an element of doubt, the doubt about the validity of two well known facts on account of their mutual contradiction The removal of this doubt is the specific function of presumption The recognition of doubt as an element serves the purpose of showing that this means of right knowledge is distinct from inference Further he explains it as follows In the case of inference the probans (say, smoke) is such that its existence is beyond doubt So, while seeing smoke undoubtedly one can immediately infer fire. But in the case of presumption, the undoubted perception of Devadatta's non-existence at home cannot lead immediately to his unperceived existence somewhere outside his home but only mediately by way of removing the doubt about his being alive[1]

Rāmānujācārya illustrates the example as follows We come to know, through perception or through words received from some one, that Devadatta does not exist at his home This non-existence at home renders his being alive unaccounted unless his existence outside home is assumed Hence Devadatta's non-existence at home is the means of presumption for the knowledge of Devadatta's existence outside home By 'rendering something unaccounted', we understand rendering doubtfull Thus on having known that Devadatta does not exist at home, we become doubtful whether Devadatta is alive or dead And this doubt will be removed by only the assumption of Devadatta's existence outside home[2].

Here one may plead that by assuming Devadatta's existence outside home we become sure that he is alive And then Devadatta's being alive can well act as probans To this the Prābhākara's reply is that in that case there will remain nothing to be inferred. For what was sought to be proved was Devadatta's existence outside home. But when

1 प्रमाणप्रतीतश्चार्थो दृष्टरूपार्थान्तराभावेन सशयमापन्न एवाऽर्थापत्तेर्जनक इति दर्शनबलादाश्रीयते ॥ PP, p 275

2 यथा जोवन् देवदत्तो गृहे नास्ति इत्यत्र गृहाभावे दृष्टे श्रुते वा । तत्रासति बहिर्भावकल्पने ... TR, p. 12

this very existence outside home is assumed nothing remains to be inferred Nor can bare non-existence at home act as a probans, because here, for such non-existence is possible even in the case of a dead person or a person not yet born

Thus there is no scope for inference in the case under consideration This is how the Prābhākara defends his position that a fact that renders another fact doubtful is the means of presumption, in case this doubt is removed by assuming a third fact In the case of inference, certainly, there is no such evocation of doubt as we find in the case of presumption. Hence presumption is distinct And this is different from the Bhāṭṭa's presumption The Bhāṭṭa describes that in the case under consideration Devadatta's non-existence at home itself remains contradicted for until his existence outside home is assumed This is how the Bhātta treats non existence at home as the means of presumption for knowing existence outside home. The Bhāṭṭa's view is just the reverse of the Prābhākara's view Because the Prābhākara says that the fact of Devadatta's existence outside home is explained by the assumption of his non existence at home

The Bhāṭṭa and the Prābhākara differ from each other in their description of presumption The Bhāṭṭa says that presumption primarily involves the contradiction between two well known facts, so that any additional element such as doubt must be out of place within the structure of this means of knowledge. The contradiction involved in presumption is the distinction between presumption and inference The Prābhākara accepts that presumption involves an element of doubt, the doubt about the validity of two well known facts on account of their mutual contradiction The removal of doubt is the function of presumption The recognition of doubt as an element is the distinction between presumption and inference.

NON - APPREHENSION

In addition to the above mentioned means of right knowledge the Bhāṭṭa admits a sixth kind of the means, viz, non-apprehension [anupalabdhi], for the apprehension of the non existence [of a thing]. E g 'There is no jar here on the floor' This is not perception For it is not caused by any sense contact The sense-contact either conjunction [saṃyoga] or inherence [samavāya] with non-existence is not possible For, such relations are positive while the latter is negative Even the relation of the qualifier and the qualified [viśeṣaṇa viśeṣyabhāva] is not possible, it disappears as the radical-relation whether conjunction or inherence is rejected It cannot be reduced in any other means of right knowledge

Śabarasvāmin defines non-apprehension in the statement, 'Non-apprehension stands for the non-operation of the [five] means of right knowledge, and it is what brings about the apprehension that 'it does not exist' in regard to things not in contact with the sense organs' [abhāvopi pramāṇābhāvaḥ nāsti ityasya arthasya asannikṛṣṭasya[1]]

BHĀṬṬA VIEW

Kumārila defines non-apprehension as follows · — 'That is, in a case where the five means of right knowledge are not found to be operative towards bringing about the notion of the existence of a certain thing, we have the notion of the existence of the thing: and that means by which this notion is broughtout is called non-apprehension[2]'

In this connection Pārthasārathi explains that every object can be viewed in two ways according to its existence and non-existence. That object when it exists somewhere

1 SBh, 1-1-5, p 39

2 प्रमाणपञ्चक यत्र वस्तुरूपे न जायते ।
वस्तुसत्तावबोधार्थं तत्राभावप्रमाणता ॥ SV, Abhāva, st. 1

in its own form [sadrūpeṇa], say, jug, is then regarded through perception as it is existing But it somewhere non exists then perception, etc, (which manifest objects of positive character) fail to function even though all the accessories for the manifestation (of such positive existence) are present. For that purpose, to manifest the non-existence, non apprehension should be accepted as a distinct means of right knowledge[1]

Non-existence is of four divisions, viz, 1) previous non-existence [prāgabhāva], e g, the non-existence of the curd in the milk, 2) non-existence by destruction [pradhvaṁsābhāva], e g, the non-existence of the milk in the curd, 3) mutual non-existence [anyonyābhāva], e.g, the non-existence of the cow in the horse and vice versa, and 4) absolute non-existence [atyantābhāva], e g, the non-existence of horns on the head of hare Here Kumārila observes that if non-existence were unreal it could not have such varieties, but it has four kinds, hence it cannot be unreal[2]

Criticism against the Bhāṭṭa's stand (on non-apprehension and non-existence) comes from two sides · the Naiyāyika who himself agrees with the Bhātta in treating non-existence as somehting existing side by side with the positive entities, argues that the ordinary means of right knowledge are competent to grasp non-existence and that therefore it is unnecessary to posit non-apprehension as an additional means of right knowledge alleged to be solely competent to grasp non-existence, the Prābhākara, who repudiated the idea of treating non existence as something existing side by side with the positive entities, is even more emphatic in the rejection of non-apprehension as an additional means of right knowledge alleged to be solely competent to grasp non-existence.

The Bhāṭṭa's answer to the Naiyāyika's criticism is that non-existence is not known through perception, because we can know non-existence even in such cases where no employment of sense-organs has taken place E g., suppose somebody

1 सर्वं हि वस्तु सद्रसदात्मना द्विविधम् ... SD, p. 83

2 न चावस्तुन एते स्युर्भेदास्तेनास्य वस्तुता । SV, Abhāva, st. 8

asks one in the noon whether one had seen a man of such and such description there in the morning, also suppose that one had not seen the man of that particular description there in the morning Under these conditions one's negative reply to the question put to one will be a result of no employment of sense organs on one's part Certainly, one cannot employ one's sense-organs to perceive 'that man's non-existence there in the morning', nor will one be recalling 'that man's non-existence there in the morning' (and that is because one had no perception of 'that man's non-existence there in the morning') The only possible explanation of one's knowledge of 'that man's non-existence there in the morning' will be that this knowledge is caused by 'absence of memory of that man's presence there in the morning' under conditions when such memory is possible[1]. This explanation can be extended even to those cases where perception of some sort is taking place E g, When one is seeing empty floor one is having a knowledge of 'non–existence of jar on the floor', but this knowledge of 'non existence of jar' is caused not by one's sense organs but by one's 'absence of perception of jar' under conditions when such perception is possible The non-existence (of jar) itself is known neither through perception nor through memory but purely through the mind[2]

Non-existence is not known through inference, because non-existence is not known as the invariable concomitant of a probans Thus one should not think that one can argue —

Wherever there is presence of knowledgeable entity, i e an entity capable of being known and just now being sought to be known, there is knowledge of this entity

Here there is no knowledge of such and such a knowledgeable entity.

1 योऽहनि प्रातःकाले गृहेऽवस्थितो माध्यदिन .. SD, p. 86
2 गृहीत्वा वस्तुसद्भाव स्मृत्वा च प्रतियोगिनम् ।
मानस नास्तिताज्ञान जायतेऽक्षानपेक्षया । SV, Abhāva, st. 27

Here there is no presence (or here there is no absence) of this entity

For in order to have an invariable concomitance of the form 'wherever there is no knowledge of a knowledgeable entity there is non existence of this entity' we must first somehow have the knowledge of the particular places where 'non-existence of knowledge (of the knowledgeable entity) and non existence of the knowledgeable entity, have been found to go together; again, the inference in question requires also the knowledge of the place in question as possessed of 'non-existence of knowledge' That is to say, the formulation of this inference is preceded by many a case of knowledge of 'non existence' Now this knowledge cannot come about through perception while we will be faced with an infinite regress, if another inference becomes necessary in order to arrive it[1] The only way out of these difficulties is that non apprehension should be accepted as an additional means of right knowledge to grasp non-existence

Kumārila explains the utility of the means of non-apprehension in the interpretation of the Vedic texts as follows To explain that the fruits of one sacrifice is not produced by another, that one principal sacrifice is not accessory of another and that two accessories of a principle sacrifice are not accessories of each other requires the aid of the means of non-apprehension[2].

PRĀBHĀKARA VIEW

Prabhākara refutes the Bhātta view, i e non-apprehension is an additional means of right knowledge and that non-existence is a different category, and interprets the Bhāsya

1 नाप्यनुमेय, अज्ञातेन तेन कस्यचिल्लिङ्गस्य
सम्बन्धग्रहणासम्भवात्। यदत्र कैश्चिदुच्यते SD, p. 87

2 कर्माणि सर्वाणि फलैस्समस्तै. सर्वैः यथावच्च यदङ्गकाण्डै.।
न सङ्गतानीह परस्पर हि नाङ्ग तदेतत्प्रभव क्रतूनाम्॥
SV, Abhāva, st 56

sentence, 'Abhāvopi pramāṇābhāvaḥ nāsti ityasyārthasya asannikṛstasya[1]' by way of supplement to the definitions of other means of right knowledge, and not to be the definitions of an additional means of right knowledge in the shape of non-apprehension? The Prābhākara argues that a means of right knowledge can be regarded as really so only if it brings about its effect, in the shape of the definite knowledge of its objective; and this definite knowledge is always in the form of 'this' which implies exclusion of all other things. Since no such effect appears through non-apprehension, it should not be counted as an additional means of right knowledge. And non existence involves, firstly, the denial of something and can not be said to be mere denial. The denial of something involves the apprehension of some thing that is other than that which is denied, whose place it has taken. Secondly, it might mean the apprehension of the non-existence at some place and time of some thing already apprehended and as such it is determinition of non correspondence with the past experience merely without a detailed investigation of the present experience.

The Prābhākara contends that the basis of nagative proposition is the mere locus [kevalādhikarṇa]. For instance, in the proposition 'There is no jar here on this floor', the only thing which in fact, is referred to is the mere floor. If non-existence should thus be equated with the empty locus, it might easily be argued from the opposite camp that this is an evasive trick of the Prābhākara which could be easily seen through and that the concept of the 'mereness of the locus' inevitably presupposes non-existence. The Prābhākara, however, meets this difficulty by explaining that the phrase, 'mere locus' is only a description of the form of the knowledge underlying negative statement and that non-existence, stricktly speaking, is the knowledge of the locus, and of nothing else, in such

1 SBh, 1-1-5, p. 39

2 किमनेन पूर्वोक्तानां प्रमाणता स्वरूपमवसीयते ? यत्पूर्वोक्तैरेव स्वलक्षणैर्नावसीयते । सर्वस्वलक्षणाभिधानवाक्यशेषोऽयं ग्रन्थः । Bṛhatī, p. 121

circumstances as would necessarily lead to the counter-positive (pratiyogin) being cognised, were it present Hence, Śālika-nātha describes non-existence as 'Non-existence is the cognition of that (locus) alone, when the counter-positive (the thing denied in a negative statement) ought to have been percieved where it is present'[1].

According to the Prābhākara, knowledge of things is of two kinds :— one takes place when a thing is viewed as accompanied by some other thing the other when a thing is viewed as existing alone The latter knowledge is again of two kinds :— one takes place when we have in mind a counter-positive of perceptible nature, the other when we have in mind a counter-positive of imperceptible nature It is our knowledge of a thing as existing alone along with our having in mind a counter-positive of perceptible nature, that is called 'non-existence (of knowledge) of this counter-positive'[2]. Hence non-existence is not merely a knowledge of something as existing alone , for that would not enable us to distinguish between one non-existence and another It is only when we have a counter-positive of perceptible nature in mind that we know a non-existence. Thus when some thing is known and a particular counter-positive of perceptible nature is had in mind the knowledge of this thing is called 'non-existence' (of knowledge) of this counter-positive 'So when a man says' 'there is no jar here on this floor' what he means is that he is seeing the mere floor while it was possible for him to have seen a jar as well

When one knows a mere locus i e. something that the Bhāṭṭa calls, 'a locus containing some non-existence of one of the four types' and has in mind a counter-positive of perceptible nature there ensues, according to the Prābhākara, a non-existence (of knowledge) of this counter-posivite. The phrase

1 दृश्ये प्रतियोगिनि या तदेकविषया बुद्धिः सा तदभावो व्यपदिश्यते···
PP, p. 291.

2 भावनामवगतिर्द्विविधा–एका तावद्भावान्तरसंसृष्टविषया, अपरा तदेकविषया। यापि च तदेकविषया बुद्धिः, सापि द्विविधा···
ibid, p. 287

'is not' is indicative of a locus of this description · this is why it is said that the Prābhākara regards the word 'not' as connotative of the nature of the concerned locus[1]

Free movement on a thornless floor is also due to the knowledge of this floor as existing alone And it is quite understandable why here there should be a desire to ascertain that the concerned counter-positive, viz , thorns, is of perceptible nature[2] Similarly, the cancellation of a perception and the cancellation of an inference are due either to the knowledge of something as existing alone or due to the cancellation of some usage Thus what is cancelled is the usage of silver in relation to nacre or the usage of probans in relation to a fallacy That is to say, in the view of Prābhākara, what is cancelled is never a knowledge but always a usage[3]

The Prābhakara also accepts that the destruction of a previously existing thing is responsible to know a thing first as accompanied by some other thing (jar) and then as existing all alone But that the coming about of a destruction is always the emergence of a positive entity (and not the coming into existence of an independent entity called non-existence by destruction) The only entities that exist are positive ones, but a positive entity may either exist as accompanied by some other entity or it may exist all alone Thus the word 'destruction' stands for the emergence in to being of a positive entity as existing all alone Even the Bhāṭṭa cannot escape this position The Prâbhākara's explanation easily applies to the cases of 'destruction without leaving a trace' but the subsequent knowledge of this cognition's locus (i e , the soul wherein this

1 नास्ति शब्दश्च तादृशाधिकरणमात्रवाचकः। नञ् शब्दश्च स्वरूपमात्रपर इति प्राभाकराः। TR, p 18

2 अपि च कण्टकादिविरहिणि भूतलादौ यो निश्शङ्कः पादविन्यासादि-व्यवहारः प्रवर्तते, स तावद् भूतलमात्रपरिच्छेदनिबन्धनो.... ibid, p. 285.

3 शुक्तिकाया रजतव्यवहारो लिंगाभासे लिंगव्यवहारश्च बाध्यते। न हि ज्ञान बाध्यते किन्तु व्यवहार एव, TR, p. 18.

knowledge arise) is at the same time a knowledge of the destruction of this knowledge[1]

Rāmānujācārya shows the blemish of ad-infinitum in the Bhāṭṭa view as that even the Bhāṭṭa, who accepts non-apprehension as an additional means of knowledge, cannot maintain that a mere non-orgination of knowledge leads to knowledge of non-existence, for such non-orgination takes place even during deep sleep Again, when after first having not known a particular thing at a particular place we subsequently know this thing at this place, we say 'this thing was not (then) at this place' Here the knowledge of non existence must be due to the past non-apprehension recognized as distinct from the present non-apprehension, for the present non-apprehension is now destroyed by the present knowledge (while the past non-apprehension remains as it was) All this goes to show that non-apprehension as known (and not merely non-apprehension as an existent fact) causes knowledge of non-existence But non-apprehension is itself a non-existence Hence if the Bhātta maintains that all knowledge of non-existence is caused by non-apprehension he will land himself in an infinite regression' For, if knowledge of a non-existence requires a non-apprehension (as known), the knowledge of this non-apprehension will require another non-apprehension (as known), the knowledge of this second non-apprehension will require a third non apprehension (as known), and so on ad-infinitum

The admission of non-apprehension as an independent means of right knowledge is primarily based on the presupposition that non-existence is a distinct category That being so, the Bhāṭṭa recognizes non-existence as a separate ontological category and also, enumerates non-apprehension as a distinct means of knowledge, the Prābhākara does not admit non-existence as a distinct category and also, from the nature of case, can not accept non-apprehension as a means of right knowledge

1 यस्यापि मते प्रध्वंसाभावस्स्वीक्रियते · PP, p 288

2 तथा चानुपलब्धेरप्यभावरूपतया तज्ज्ञानमप्यनुपलभ्यमित्यनवस्था ।
TR, p 19.

PART - II

OBJECTS OF RIGHT KNOWLEDGE

CATEGORY

The Bhāṭṭa as well as the Prābhākara are upholders of realism and their reality of world is brought under certain categories [padārthas] Unlike the Buddhist, they accept the things which really exist, namely, the basic elements and their products. Padārtha (category), literally, a thing to which words refer [padasya arthah], or whatever is, is knowable [jñeya] and nameable [abhidheya] Even though any thing which is an object of right knowledge is called category, but due to convenience and comprehension, the Logicians classify the supposed realities underlying the universe under a few categories.

The Vaiśesika establishes six categories of reality, viz, substance [dravya], quality [guna], motion [karma], generality [sāmānya], particularity [viśeṣa], inherence [sāmāvāya], and non-existence [abhāva]. Kanāda and Praśastapāda enumerate only six positive categories[1] Non-existence was latter added as the seventh category. Candramati, the author of Daśapadārtha śāstra, is the first to recognize non-existence as a distinct kind of being with categorial status. The Naiyāyika describes sixteen categories, viz., means of right knowledge [pramāṇa], objects of right knowledge [prameya], doubt [saṁśaya], purpose [prayojana], example [dṛṣṭānta], tenet [siddhānta], members of syllogism [avayava], hypothetical reasoning [tarka], ascertainment [nirnaya], discussion [vāda], disputation [jalpa], wrangling [vitaṇḍā], fallacy [hetvābhāsa], quibble [chala], analogue [jāti], and points of defeat [nigraha sthāna][2]. Actually, these are not a classification of all sublunary things and they look like headings of chapters in a treatise in Logic.

1 KS, 1-1-1
2 GS, 1-1-1

The objects of right knowledge, according to the Naiyāyika, constitutes soul [ātman], body [sarira], sense-organs [indriya], objects of sense-organs [artha], intellect [buddhi], mind [manas], activity [pravṛtti], faults [doṣa], transmigration [pretyabhāva], consequences of activities [phala], suffering [duhkha] and emancipation [apavarga][1] After eleventh century the Naiyāyikas absorbed the categories of the Vaiśesika in their treatises on Nyāya and the Vaiśesikas absorbed the Nyāya categories of means of right knowledge in its developed form in their treatises on Vaiśesika The categories of the Nyāya and Vaiśeṣika are thus combined together The Sānkhya recognises only two ultimate realities, viz, nature [prakṛti] and spirit [purusa]. The Advaita vedāntin establishes only one fundamental category, viz, Brahman, together with the subordinate category of Māyā

Śabarasvāmin has referred to four categories in the Bhāṣya as follows — 'Among substances, qualities and actions that factor which is common to several individuals is the class[2]' and 'just as when it is said 'give hundred to these', what is meant is a hundred of only one kind of thing, not of several kinds of things such as substance, quality, action, constituent part and so forth'[3] Inherence [samavāya] is mentioned in several places not only by the Bhāsyakāra,[4] but also by Jaimini. The same is true of non-existence

Kumārila opposes the idealism [vijñānavāda] and the nihilism [śūnyavāda] of the Buddhists and insists on the objective reality of the external world And, further, he follows the example of the Vaiśesika in making use of a number of ontological categories Out of the seven categories of the Vaiśesika, Kumārila denies particularity [viśesa] and inherence [samavāya][5] Hence, we conclude that the remaining five

1 ibid, 1-1-9.
2 द्रव्यगुणकर्मणा सामान्यमात्रमाकृतिः, SBh, 1-3-30, p. 294.
3 यथा शतमास्या दीयतामिति एकजातीयाना शत न भिन्नजातीयानाम् । यथा द्रव्य गुणः कर्मावयव इत्येवमादीनाम् । ibid, 10-3-44 p. 1886.
4 SBh. 12-1-1 and JS, 12-1-1.
5 SV, Pratyakṣa, st. 146-150.

categories, viz, substance, quality, motion, generality and non-existence are acceptable to Kumārila The author of Pūrvatantra siddhānta ratnāvalī accepts potency [śakti] as sixth category Viśveśvarabhatta, the author of Bhātta-cintāmani, enumerates seven categories[1]

Prabhākara, like Kumārila, opposes the idealism and nihilism of the Buddhists and establishes the reality of the external world And, further, he also follows the Vaiśesika view on the objects of right knowledge He also, like Kumārila, rejects particularity but accepts inherence as a distinct category He dismisses non existence as a distinct category, and identifies it with its locus [adhikarana-svarūpa] Further, he adds three more categories, respectively called, potency [śakti], similarity [sādṛśya] and number [saṁkhyā] Hence it is clear that, according to Prabhākara, categories are eight, viz, substance, quality, motion, generality, inherence potency, similarity and number Nārāyana, the commentator of PP, adds one more category, viz, sequence [krama][2]

SUBSTANCE

Out of the five categories described in the preceding section, here we will discuss the first, i e substance It is enumerated first, because it is the substratum of all the categories The Buddhist denies substance as a distinct category and says that the sense-data—colour, taste, odour, and touch—are without any substratum, and that the attributes are the four elements which are perceived by visual, gustatory, olfactory, and tactile organs respectively Kumārila argues against this view that substance is different from the qualities and it is perceived by visual and tactile organs[3] The Buddhist doctrine, that non-difference of a substance from the qualities is proved by the absence of the perception of difference between them, is also false for the same reason No one perceives a cloth as colour

1 BC, p 17 2 NS, p 78.
3 द्रव्यमूर्तौ पुनद्विभ्या ... SV, Pratyakṣa, st 170.

(e g this is colour), but perceives it as possessed of colour Further, he says that substance is perceived before its qualities are perceived and they are perceived subsisting in a substance[1].

The Vaiśeṣika gives two definitions of substance as follows, 'Substance is the abode of qualities'[2] and Substance is the cause having inherence'[3], but all these are defective There is the defect of overpervasion in the first, since the quality would fall into the scope of the definition because the quality of number, in 'Qualities are twenty four', resides in the quality which would be a substance The second definition 'Substance is the cause having inherence' also defective because, when inherence itself is non existent, the abode of inherence is rejected at a distance

After refuting the definitions of substance given by the Vaiśesika, Nārāyana defines substance as follows 'Substance is the abode of magnitude'[4] One should not think that there is the defect of non-pervasion in that, just at the moment of its birth, the substance is devoid of quality of magnitude, because, the Bhātta accepts, for a quality and what has that quality origination at the same time A substance whether a product or an eternal variety must posses magnitude, hence all the substances come under this definition According to Kumārila, however, it is the substratum not only of magnitude but of all the properties that are attributed to a thing Pārthasārathi defines it as follows :— 'That which coheres in colour etc, which are of a fleeting nature and from which recognition [pratyabhijñā] arises, that is substance[5]' It is apprehended through visual and tactual perceptions

A substance is a composite structure consisting of component parts joined together. The Vaiśeṣika holds that a whole

1 तद्धर्मि यत्र वा ज्ञान प्राग्धर्मग्रहणाद्भवेत् । ibid, Pra, st 152.
2 गुणाश्रया द्रव्यम्, NLV, p 752, quoted in MM, p 151
3 समवायिकारण द्रव्यम्, KS, 1-1-15, quoted in ibid, p 151.
4 परिमाणगुणाधार द्रव्यम् । ibid p 151.
5 आगमापायिषु रूपादिषु यदनुयायिप्रत्यभिज्ञा जायते तद्द्रव्यम् ।
दर्शनस्पर्शनाभ्या चास्य ग्रहणम् । SD, p 42

is produced by its parts being conjoined with each other and it is something different from the parts For instance, a cloth woven of threads is altogether a different substance from the threads Pārthasārathi criticises this view on the ground of experience. In our experience, we see that the threads themselves by the peculiarity of their co-relation transforms themselves into a single substance, become a whole made of parts, and maintaining the genus of cloth, etc [1] The difference between a whole and its parts is not absolute, as described by the Vaiśeṣika, but only indentity cum-difference As a whole is concerned it is not different from its parts, e g , a person is not different from his parts, 'hands, legs, etc' As parts are concerned they are different from their whole, e g , legs, hands and other parts are not person But the parts themselves assume the form of a single substance due to a particular combination [sanniveśa]

The Vaiśesika enumerates nine substances, viz , earth [pṛthvī], water [jala], light [tejas], air [vāyu], ether [ākāśa], time [kāla], space [dik], soul [ātman] and mind [manas] Kumārila holds that direct object of apprehension is the characteristics of substance and darkness and sound are directly apprehended by visual and auditory organs respectively,[2] hence these two should be enumerated as distinctive substances Hence, according to the Bhāṭṭa, substances are eleven with the addition of darkness and sound to the list admitted by the Vaiśeṣika

Prabhākara, in agreement with the Vaiśesika, holds that substance is the inherent cause, and enumerates nine substances Hence Nārāyaṇa, the commentator of PP, defines substance as follows ; 'Substance is that which is the inherent or material cause'[3] Śalikanātha denies darkness as a distinct substance and says it is only absence of light[4] While describing ether

1 ibid, p. 42.

2 Darkness is not only a direct object of apprehension but is a substratum of black colour also.

3 समवायिकारण द्रव्यमिति द्रव्यलक्षणम् । NS on PP, p. 154

4 PP, p. 142

as the substratum of sound, he rejects sound, as a distinct substance[1] He enumerates nine substances, viz, earth, water, light, air, ether, time, space, soul and mind

EARTH

Of the substances, earth is that which has odour The Vaisesika divides it in two divisions, viz, eternal and non-eternal, and says that eternal is atomic [paramānurūpā] The Bhatta does not accept [invisible] atoms, hence there is no two fold system Earth exists in the form of the body, the olfactory organ, lump of clay, stone and so forth

The body is that which is the abode of experience It delimits the soul in which enjoyment takes place The Vedāntin does not accept that the body is wholly made of earth. He argues that it is constituted of the five physical substances [pāñcabhautika], because it has not only odour [the distinctive quality of earth] but also viscocity, hot touch, breath and cavity, the distinctive qualities of water, fire, air, and ether respectively The Bhāttā's answer to this view is that even though the distinctive qualities of all the five physical substances found in the body, the material cause [samavāyikārana] of it is only earth and the other four substances are only its accessory causes [nimitta-kārana] The body is of four kinds, viz,

1) womb-born [jarāyuja], bodies of men, animals, etc ;
2) egg-born [andaja], bodies of snakes, birds etc ,
3) sweat-born [svedaja], bodies of flies, gnats, etc , and
4) sprouts-born [udbhijja], bodies of plants, shrubs, etc

The Prābhākara does not accept sprout-born bodies on the ground that they do not have sense-organs The Bhātta criticises this view and says that it is against the statements of Codes [smrtis] and Epics E g , the Code of Manu describes that one who abuses one's preceptor, is born as a tree resorted to by eagles and vultures in the burial ground The Bhāgavata

1 ibid, p. 145

narrates the incident of Nalakūbara and Maṇigrīva who stood as a pair of Arjuna trees at Gokulam, due to a sage's curse[1] Śālikanātha contends that the statements of this nature in the Codes and in the Epics are not based on the Veda, because these do not describe things that are to be done [kārya] Hence these are not authoritative This contention is false, since the purport of the Veda is not only in things that are to be done, but also in those that are existent Therefore, being based on that, these statements are authoritative

The Bhātta says that the rejection of the vegetable bodies on the ground of their not being the abodes of sense organs is wrong, because there is found growth and decay which are conditioned by the presence and absence of nourishment, etc and there is found the effect of loss of qualities, as for other bodies, by burning, cutting, etc, and the experience (of happiness and misery) is established, the experience is not at all possible without having sense-organs, hence, having of sense-organs is certain[2].

Kumārila describes sense-organ as the instrument of perceptual knowledge[3] Pārthasārathi defines it as follows 'That is called sense-organ which generates a clear and specific knowledge of the object with which it comes into contact'[4] These sense-organs are material substances in as much as they invariably receive obstruction Nothing can offer obstruction to a non-material ubiquitous substance The sense-organs receive obstruction from wall, etc, and are therefore material substances. Among these, mind is the internal, and the rest are external Among the external organs, the olfactory organ perceives odour and hence is composed of earth, because only the earthy substance is found to manifest smell, E g, when the paste of margosa bark [nimbatvak] is applied to sandal, the odour of the sandal is manifested.

1 श्मशाने जायते वृक्षः कङ्कगृध्रनिषेवित ।
नलकूबमणिग्रीववासतुर्यमुलार्जुनौ ॥ MM, p. 154.

2 ibid, p. 156. 3 करण चेन्द्रिय ·· SV, Pra, st. 121.

4 यत्संप्रयुक्तेऽर्थे विशदावभासं विज्ञान जनयति तदिन्द्रियम् । SD, p 36.

Prabhākara, like the Bhātta, enumerates nine substances. Of these earth is the first, because it is the material cause of the body. Nārāyana defines earth as follows: 'Earth is that which possesses odour'[1]. One should not think that there is the defect of non-pervasion in the definition, since stones are devoid of odour, because odour can be perceived in their ashes. It is endowed with the qualities of odour [gandha], taste [rasa], colour [rūpa], touch [sparśa], magnitude [parimāna], weight [gurutva], artificial fluidity [sāmsiddhika drava], tendency [saṁskāra], conjunction [saṁyoga], disjunction [vibhāga], remoteness [paratva], and proximity [aparatva]. It is of two kinds, eternal and transitory. Earth in the form of atoms is eternal[2], and that in the form of products is transitory. It exists in the forms of the bodies, the olfactory organ, lump of clay, trees, stone, etc.

The body is the abode of the sense organs[3]. It is of three kinds – 1) womb-born [yonija], such as the body of a human being or of an animal; 2) egg born [andaja], the body of a bird, a snake, etc., 3) sweat born [svedaja], the body of a worm, a gnat, etc. The Bhātta accepts sprout born bodies, but the Prābhākara rejects this view on the ground that there is no proof for the view that sprout-born bodies are possessed with the sense-organs. Jaimini and Śabara also favour this view. They both describe trees as insensate things. Jaimini's aphorism is as follows, 'Because they are addressed to insensate things'[4]. Śabara's bhāṣya on the aphorism is as follows: 'The hymn[5] contains a request addressed to an insensate object, the herb, certainly, the herb, which is insensate, could never understand the request'[6].

Actually speaking, the four fold division of the bodies—of the Bhātta is more worthy than the three fold division of the bodies—of the Prābhākara, because the latter's view is

1 NS, p 80 2 ibid, p 78. 3 PP, p 330

4 अचेतने अर्थबन्धात् । JS, 1-2-35

5 ओषधे त्रायस्वैनम् · Taittirīyasamhitā 1-2-1-1

6 अचेतनेऽर्थे खल्वर्थं निबध्नन्ति ·· SBh, 1-2-35.

not only against to the Nyāya-Vaiśesika view but also to the statements of Codes and Epics Even the modern biological science also establishes that the trees' bodies having senses

Unlike the Vedāntin, the Prābhākara also accepts that the body is made of earth, and the other four physical substances are its accessory causes As has already been shown, the olfactory organ is composed of earth, because among colour and the rest it reveals only odour which is the specific quality of earth The object is everything beginning with the dyad [dvyaṇuka] and ending with the universe Thus, a body having odour, is the earthy body , a sense-organ perceiving odour is the earthy organ, and an object having odour is the earthy object

WATER

Water is the abode of natural fluidity[1] It has only sweet taste One should not argue that, since bitter and other tastes are perceived in water, water may as well have bitter taste, etc , because the eating of the myrobalan, which is believed to have the efficasy of cleansing and stimulating the tongue and enabling it to bring out the natural taste of water, reveals the essential sweetness of water. Its colour is non-luminous white It cannot be urged that since we observe blue colour in the waters of the Yamunā, water may as well have blue colour etc because the perception of blue colour in the waters of Yamunā is only super-imposed by the conjunction of earthy particles Hence, it has only non-luminous white colour The natural touch of water is cold Due to heating, it looks like being warm, but that is merely temporary After a sometime we will find the natural touch of it, i e cold

It appears in the forms of gustatory organ and objects The Vaiśesika accepts watery body as the third form of water and follows the mythological tradition that the body composed of water is in the world of Water god [Varuna], but the

1 स्वाभाविकद्रवत्वाधिकरणं सलिलम् । MM, p. 157.

Bhāṭṭa does not accept watery body on the ground that it is not perceptible. Gustatory organ is composed of water, because it reveals taste without revealing any other quality, analogically to the water that reveals the taste of fried barley dust The objects are lakes, rivers, oceans, snow, hail, etc One can not argue that since snow is solid, it must be earthy because when it melts under heat, it is perceived to be water

The Prābhākara gives two definitions of water as follows - 'water is that which possesses taste, not produced by the application of heat' and 'water is that which has natural fluidity'[1] It is endowed with the qualities of taste, colour, touch, magnitude, heaviness, natural fluidity, velocity [vega], and viscocity [sneha] The Prābhākara, in agreement with the Vaiśeṣika, accepts that water is of two kinds, viz , eternal [atomic] and transitory

The transitory water appears in the forms of gustatory organ and objects. The Prābhākara, unlike the Vaiśeṣika, does not accept watery body Both the Bhāṭṭa and the Prābhākara argue, on the same grounds, that gustatory organ is composed of water[2]. The objects are seas, rivers, snow, hail, etc

LIGHT

Light is that which has the quality of hot touch[3] Here, one should not think that there is the defect of over-pervasion in the definition since it applies to the knowledge 'this water is hot', because such knowledge arises in water owing to the contact of fire with water. Also it cannot be urgued that there is the defect of non-prevasion in the definition, since there is no hotness in the rays of moon, because the moon's rays are suppressed by the water supposed to be present

1 अपाकजरसवत्त्वमब्लक्षणम् । सांसिद्धिकद्रवत्व वा ॥
NS, p 80

2 See supra, p. 76

3 उष्णस्पर्शगुण तेज । MM, p 157.

in the moon Its colour is glowing white The white colour that is in fire is not perceived, as it is overcome by the earthy colour Both the Bhāṭṭa and the Prābhākara do not accept body composed of light which is, according to the Vaiśesika, exist in the solar region Light appears in the forms of visual organ and object Visual organ is composed of light, because it reveals the colour of others without revealing other qualities, like a lamp.

The object is of four kinds · 1) earthy, fire and the like, 2) heavenly, lightning produced from watery fuel, 3) gastric, cause for digestion of food eaten, and 4) mineral, lustrous metals like gold, etc It cannot be argued that gold is an earthy product, since it possesses yellowish colour and is weighty like turmeric, because earthy products, like ghee, vanish when extreme heat is applied, but when that is applied to gold, melted gold does not vanish.

The Prābhākara defines light as that which possesses hot touch[1] It is endowed with the qualities of colour, touch, magnitude, conjunction, disjunction, remoteness, proximity, easiness [laghu] and velocity [vega] It is of two kinds, viz, eternal (atomic) and transitory The transitory is of two kinds, viz, visual organ and object The Prābhākara, like the Bhāṭṭa, argues that visual organ is composed of light on the same grounds[2] The objects of light are fire, gold, etc

AIR

Air is that which has touch, while having no colour[3] It has zig-zag motion and is to be perceived by tactile organ The Vaiśeṣika denies peceptibility to air on the ground that it has no manifested colour. According to him, manifested colour is the cause in perceiving a thing. Further, he argues that air is inferred by touch. His argument is as follows. The

1 उष्णस्पर्शवत्तेजः। NS, p. 80. 2 See supra, p. 76
3 अरूपत्वे सति स्पर्शवान्वायु.। MM, p. 159.

neither-hot-nor-cold' touch that we feel on the blowing of the wind must reside in some substance as it is a quality, like colour Earth cannot be its substratum, because all earthy substances having manifested touch have also manifested colour, while air has no manifested colour Nor can it reside in water and light, because it is neither cold nor hot Nor can it reside in the four ubiquitous substances (ether, time, space and soul), for if it resides in them, then it ought to be found everywhere Nor does it reside in mind, because, if it did, the mind being atomic, touch residing in atom, cannot be felt, it being beyond apprehension by the sense organs Therefore, that which is revealed to us as the substratum of touch is air

The Bhātta criticises the Vaisesika view, i e, on the blowing of wind, we recognize only the mere touch nothing else, and says that it is certainly against experience In our experience of jars of different colours, we have the recognition of one and the same substance, jar, in the form 'The jar is black', 'The jar is yellow,' 'The jar is white' Same like, when particular touches, like cold touch, etc., are experienced there is the recognition of the same substance, air, in the form, 'The air is cold', 'The air is hot', 'The air is neither cold nor hot'[1].

The Bhātta holds that colour is not a cause in all perceptions of substances through the sense organs because there is no such evidence By the method of agreement [anvaya] and difference [vyatireka], in visual perception colour is a cause, in tactual perception touch and so on[2] It may be pointed out here that some later Naiyāyikas, following the Bhātta view, have repudiated that air is perceptible substance

Air appears in the forms of tactile organ and objects Tactile organ is aerial, since among colour and the rest it reveals only touch, as in the case of the breeze set in by a fan, which reveals the cold touch of water (perspiration) that clings to the body Objects are the cause that shakes trees, etc ,

1 ibid, p. 159 2 ibid, p. 160.

and vital breath [Prāna] The air that circulates within the body is vital breath. It is only one, but owing to its different locations and different functions, it is known by various names The air that is inhaled and exhaled through the mouth and the nostrils is Prāna The air that presses down water, etc , is Apāna. The air that helps in the digestion of food, etc , by stimulating gastric fire in the stomach is Samāna. The air that takes the digested food upward from the navel is Udāna And the air that courses through the nervous system is the vital air [vyāna][1]

The Prābhākara defines air as follows 'Air is that which has touch of neither hot nor cold and not changed through the application of fire'[2]. Neither hot nor cold touch is also present in earth, therefore, to remove the defect of over-pervasion, the word 'which is not changed through the application of fire Touch which is not changed through the application of fire is also present in water, therefore, to remove the over-pervasion, the word 'neither hot nor cold' It is endowed with the qualities of touch, magnitude, conjunction, disjunction, remoteness, proximity, easiness [laghu] and tendency [saṃskāra].

It is of two kinds, viz , eternal [atomic] and transitory The transitory is of three kinds, viz , tactile organ, object and vital breath. Tactile organ, which perceives touch, is composed of air and that organ is found all over the body. Object is the air that has zig-zag motion and shakes trees and such other things In agreement with the Bhaṭṭa, the Prābhākara accepts that air is perceptible Air that circulates within the body is vital breath Though one, it is denoted variously as Prāṇa, Apāna, etc , owing to different situations. Here it should be noticed that the Bhātta includes vital breath under mass, but the Prābhākara mentions it as a distinct kind of air being different from tactile organ and mass We can find

1 हृदि प्राणो गुदेऽपानो समानो नाभिसस्थित: ।
उदान: कण्ठदेशस्थो व्यानस्सर्वशरीरग. ॥

2 अपाकजाऽनुष्णाशीतस्पर्शवान्वायु: । NS, p 80.

different opinions regarding the distinct status of vital breath in the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika system also. Praśastapāda and old-Naiyāyikas mention vital breath as a distinct kind of air being different from the organ and mass While neo-Naiyāyikas generally include it under mass

DARKNESS

Darkness is enumerated as the fifth substance by the Bhātta His argument is as follows According to the characteristic of substances, a substance should possess quality and action Darkness has black colour and movement Hence it should be counted as a substance The usage, 'black darkness moves' and the Vedic revelation, 'black darkness stood clear' [tamah krsnam vyaktam asthita] also prove its existence, having black colour and movement[1]. And it is quite distinct from all the above mentioned substances Earth possesses odour but it does not have odour Water has cold touch but it does not possess touch. Light is the abode of hot touch but it lacks hot touch also. Air has zig-zag motion and neither cold nor hot touch but it has neither touch nor constant motion. The remaining substances, viz , ether, time, space, soul and mind, do not have colour, but darkness has black colour. Hence it should be counted as a distinct substance.

The Logicians hold · darkness is of the nature of absence of light. Among the Logicians, Uddyotakāra says that darkness denotes things which are not apprehended due to the absence of light. Śrīdhara, the author of Nyāyakandalī, mentions that darkness is a kind of the quality of colour and nothing more than the black colour imposed on something else The Vaiśesika contends that darkness should not be accepted as a substance having colour for the simple reason that it is not tangible The Bhāṭṭa criticises this view and says that the contention that in the case of every tangible thing there is

1 श्रुतिरपि तमसो नीलरूपतामनुवदति । MM, p 167.

found colour too is false for, it would result that air is not tangible since it has no colour Hence darkness should be accepted as a distinct substance

The Prābhākara denies darkness as a substance and holds that it is absence of knowledge of light His argument is as follows: When light is not seen, there is the remembrance of black substances generally. Because of the perception of the form of the self who is the apprehender In respect of one who does not apprehend the remembrance-form of this, there is the empirical usage of darkness being black, conditiond by the non-apprehension of distinction between the two, the perception and the remembrance The Bhātta criticises this view on the ground that it is against experience, i e, when there is the non-apprehension of the distinction between the remembrance of blackness and the apprehension of the self, one should say 'I am black' not 'This is black', but while perceiving darkness all are saying 'This is black' not 'I am black'[1] Hence darkness should be accepted as a distinct substance

THE CONCEPT OF ATOMS

Kumārila holds that a whole is composed of its parts conjoined with each other Physical substances, viz, earth, water, fire, air and darkness, are divisible into parts, which are ultimately divisible into atoms which are supposed to be indivisible Cidānanda says that the atom should be accepted as indivisible, i e, not composite, otherwise if we assume an atom also to be composed of still smaller parts, it would result in the defect of infinite-regression[2] And the inevitable result of this would be that, all things being equally composed of infinite component particles, there would not be found

1 आत्मग्रहणस्य नैल्स्मृत्या भेदाग्रहे सति 'इद नीलम्'··· ibid, p. 163.

2 तथा सति मातङ्गमशकयोरनन्तावयवपरिप्रापितत्वाविशेषेणा-
वयवसख्याभूयस्त्वाल्पत्वनिबन्धनस्य महदणुभेदस्यानुपपत्ति. ।
NTV, p. 86.

any difference between an elephant and a mosquito as one is bigger and another is smaller The idea is thus :— It is nothing but the greater or smaller number of atoms that makes one thing bigger and another smaller A thing like an elephant is larger because it contains larger number of parts than a mosquito which is smaller to elephant because it contains lesser number of parts To calculate these numbers we must have a common unit like an atom If we do not postulate the atom as an indivisible unit and, instead, go on dividing ad-infinitum, then, the number of parts in elephant and masquito will be equal but the parts will vary in magnitude and the question why one is larger than the other will remain unresolved This is solved thus : A thing is larger or smaller according to the magnitude of parts in them are larger and smaller.

The atom is visible It appears in the form of finest particle of mote shining in the sun-beam proceeding through the opening of a window The Vaiśesika holds that what the Bhāṭṭa say as atom is triad [tryanuka] which is produced by three dyads [dvyanuka], which are produced by two partless and indivisible atoms Vidyābhūsana summarizes the Nyāya-Vaisesika view on atoms as follows : 'In the Nyāya-sūtra 4 2 16, it is stated that there can never come a time when there will be an utter annihilation of things Even at the dissolution of the world [pralaya] things will continue to exist in the form of atoms The atom can not be divided into parts because it is pervaded by ether in its inner and outer sides It is not tenable because the terms 'inner side' and 'outer side' are not applicable to an eternal atom which is altogether different from an ordinary thing a constituent of which encloses, or enclosed by, another constituent of it'[1]. Atoms do not perish even at the dissolution of the world At the creation of the world, owing to the creative will of the God, motion is first produced in atoms. Then from the conjunction of two atoms a dyad is produced Then as a consequence of conjunction of three dyads, a triad is produced Similarly, with

1 The History of Indian Logic, pp. 105-106.

four triads, a quardrate is produced, and so on and on until the great masses of earth, water, light and ether are formed

Kumārila denies creation and dissolution of the universe[1] and observes that the physical universe, as a whole, 'was never other than what it is now' [na kadācid anīdrśam jagat] The universe neither has had beginning nor end It is self-existent, eternal and uncreated and consequently the ultimate substances never exist in the their state, i e , in the form of disjoined super-sensous atoms According to him, the smallest perceptible mote, which is seen in the sun-beam coming through the window and which corresponds to the triad of the Vaiśeṣika system, is the atom. The Vaiśeṣika considers it as triad (composed of three dyads) and divides it into dyads (composed of two partless super-sensous atoms) and finally into (partless and super sensous) atoms on the ground of inference The two axioms of the inference is as follows : 'Every visible thing is composed of parts, for a thing in order to be visible must have three dimensions, length, breadth and thickness' and 'Every object having parts is divisible into any number of smaller parts' Kumārila holds that the atoms as conceived by the Vaiśeṣika are non-existent inasmuch as we have no means of knowing them and criticises the use of inference for upsetting the result of well-established facts of perception He says that the employment of logic or Yogic perception to defeat common sense are spurious. According to the Bhāṭṭa, composite substances, i e earth, water, light, air and darkness, are constituted by atoms, but that the atoms concerned are, like the particles of dust in the sun-beam, definitely perceptible.

The Prābhākara, in agreement with the Vaiśeṣika, accepts atoms as the ultimate constituents of the physical universe. These are indivisible and eternal He establishes the existence of the atoms on the basis of inference[2] as follows :— 'Triad is a composite of parts (three dyads), because it is a perceivable substance, like a cloth' and 'Dyad also is a composite of parts

1 प्रलयेऽपि प्रमाणं न. सर्गोच्छेदात्मके हि न । SV, sam, st. 68

2 परमाणुद्व्यणुकयो त्रसेरण्वादिकार्यद्रव्यलिङ्गकानुमानम् । NS, p. 81.

(two atoms), because it produces large magnitude, i e, triad, like a thread'. Further, the atom, should not be divided into parts, because that would lead to the defect of adinfinitum Even though the Prābhākara, in agreement with the Vaisesika, admits atoms but, as against the Vaiseṣika, rejects creation and dissolution of the world

ETHER

Ether [Ākāśa] is a ubiquitous substance We are thus immediately aware of ether everywhere around us as the locus of everything that we perceive Also we mark the presence or the absence of flying bird up there The obvious reference, here, is to a directly perceived locus, and this is ether The texts of the Bhāṭṭa school have advanced a number of arguments in defence of the position that ether is a perceptible substance One such argument, which is given in the Nyāyatatvāvirbhāva and substantially reproduced in the Mānameyodaya is as follows 'whatever is ubiquitous and different from mind, is perceptible Ether is such a thing Therefore, ether is perceptible'[1] Ether is all-pervading,— i. e. possessed of largest dimension, this being shown by the fact that its effect is found everywhere.

The Vaiśesika inferes the existence of ether as the substratum of sound by the method of elimination [pariśesa] The subsistence of a certain quality in a number of things being suspected, when the impossibility of such subsistence in some of those things is proved, the notion that we have of the quality subsisting in the remaining things is what is called method of elimination Sound being a quality, it should inhere in a substance We see that sound is not a special quality of tangible substances (i e. earth, water, light and air), because while haveing the conjunction of fire as its non-inherent cause, it is produced independently of the qualities of its cause, and is perceptible, as is the case with pleasure Nor is it a quality

1 NTV, p 67, MM, p. 191.

of space, time and mind, because it is a special quality and space, etc, do not possess special qualities Nor is it a quality of the soul, because it is perceptible to external organ Thus ether, the substratum of sound, should be accepted as a substance by the method of elimination

The Bhāṭṭa rejects the Vaiśesika view mainly on the ground that sound is a substance He argues that it cannot be a quality, because it is perceived independently as a substratum[1] One of the criteria of quality is that it is perceived invariably as dependent upon a substance It is only a substance which is independently and directly perceived and which can exist as a self-subsistent real Thus the characteristic of quality being found lacking, and its affinity with substance being clearly observable, it stands to reason that sound should be held to be a substance Cidānanda further argues that let sound be a quality, even then the existence of ether as the substratum of sound cannot be established, because according to the rule of parcimony—to assume a quality in an established substance is worthy than to assume a non established substance[2], it should be accepted as the quality of space or time not that of ether Hence ether should be established on the proof of perception As described above, it is perceptible to everyone immediately on opening the eyes

The Vaiśeṣika holds auditory organ as composed of ether by the method of elimination Kumārila rejects the Vaiśesika view on the ground that it is against the Vedic revelation[3] The Veda says 'auditory organ is from space' [diśah śrotram], hence it should be assumed that auditory organ is the space enclosed in the ear-cavity

The Prābhākara, in agreement with the Vaiśeṣika, infers the existence of ether as the substratum of sound by the method of elimination Śālikanātha criticises the view of the Bhāṭṭa that sound is a substance and establishes that it is a special

1 तत्र गुणस्य सर्वत्र साश्रयतया प्रतीयमानत्वाद् ·· MM, p 223.
2 असिद्धद्रव्यकल्पनापूर्वकाश्रयत्वकल्पनात् NTV, p. 67
3 दिग्भागे तु समस्तोऽसावागमात्तु विशिष्यते । SV, Śabda ni., p 145.

quality on the ground of inferences as follows. 'Sound is a special quality, since it is perceptible to single external organ, as in the case of colour' 'Now sound being a quality, is inherent in a substance, as is conjunction' These inferences prove that sound inheres in a substance. It is not a quality of earth, water, fire, air, time, space, soul or mind So it is a quality of ether Thus ether, which is the substratum of sound, is established'

Thus we find that ether exists, and we have already seen that it is and must be an all-pervading (ubiquitous), and being a ubiquitous, it must also be eternal, unproduced and indestructible It is also absolutely motionless For being a ubiquitous, it cannot be conceived as moving from one place to another, nor can it contract and expand, Finally, it is super-sensible, as it neither is, nor can ever be, perceived by the sense-organs But although itself super-sensible, its special quality, sound is perceptiple to the auditory organ

The Bhāṭṭa denies sound as a quality and holds it as a distinct substance And accepting ether to be eternal, indivisible and ubiquitous, he comes to regard that the question of the possibility of its being inferred cannot arise, and consequently, that it must be perceptible The Prābhākara, in agreement with the Vaiseṣika, says that ether is inferable on the ground of its being the substratum of sound regarded as a perceivable quality

TIME

The Grammarian holds time and space as modifications of the subtle sound [śabdatanmātra] The Buddhist says that these are merely forms of momentary and fleeting consciousness [vijñāna] The Sāṃkhya includes these under ether Neo-Naiyāyikas like Raghunātha Śiromani identify these with God. The Mīmāmsaka, in agreement with the Vaiśesika, regards these as independent substances Kumārila describes time as

1 शब्दलक्षणगुणानुमानसिद्धत्वात् । PP, p 324.

one, ubiquitous and eternal entity, like the word, its divisions are derived from its association with the limiting adjuncts [upādhi] in the form of moments, hours, days, months, years and the like[1] Time is also apprehended as a qualifying element [viśeṣana] in the form of events as nearness [para], remoteness [apara], simultaneity [yaugapadya], succession [ayaugapadya], slowness [cira], quickness [ksipra], etc One should not confuse nearness and remoteness of time with those of space, because the nearness and remoteness due to time is brought about by the sun's movements , while those pertaining to space are not brought about by the movements of the sun

Though time is really one only, yet through certain conditions in the shape of present, past and future actions, it comes to bear the names of present, past, and future , as a man, through his different types of actions of dancing, singing and the like comes to be known as a dancer, singer and the like. The time determined by action is present, and the time determined by the pre non-existence of action is past, and the time determined by the past non-existence of action is future.

The Naiyāyika contends, that time is invisible because it lacks the condition of perceptibitily, i e , possession of colour. The contention is false because a colourless object (i e ether) is perceived So time is peceived A moment is perceived A day is recognized. Time is perceived as a qualification of the perceived objects Pārthsārathi says that if time were not immediately given in experience, such characteristics of events as existence, succession, etc , would never come within our perception Since these perceived determination of events necessarily involve a direct reference to time, it must be held that time is invariably presented as a qualification [viśeṣana] in our perception of events[2] Cidānanda proves its perceptibility on the ground of inference as follows : 'Whatever is ubiquitous while being different from mind is

1 कालश्चैको विभुर्नित्य प्रविभक्तोऽपि गम्यते ।
वर्णवत्सर्वभागेषु व्यज्यते केनचित्क्वचित् ॥ SV, Śabda ni , st 303

2 NR on SV. Śabdanitya., st. 303.

a perceivable substance, like the soul, Time is such a thing Therefore, time is a perceivable substance'[1]

The Prābhākara, in agreement with the Vaiśeṣika, holds that time cannot be perceived because it lacks the necessary characteristics of perception, i e, infinite magnitude [mahatva], dimension and manifest form [udbhūtattva] The notions of nearness, remoteness, etc, are determinate subjective phenomena, and their emergence can be explained only on the supposition of their being causally related to a specific objective ground, and this is time Time, therefore, is to be inferred as the cause of certain notions which are found to be associated with events, and which cannot be explained otherwise It is endowed with the qualities of magnitude, dimension conjunction and disjunction It is indivisible, eternal and ubiquitous[2].

The Bhāṭṭa holds that time is eternal, indivisible and ubiquitous and arrives at the view that it, like ether, is reluctunt to the possibility of its being inferred, and must be amenable to direct and immediate apprehension The Prābhākara, in aggreement with the Vaiśeṣika, holds that time is inferable

SPACE

Kumārila holds that space is eternal, one, ubiquitous and amenable to the direct apprehension of nearness and remoteness and so forth Pārthasārathi says that even though space is not perceived as independent by auditory organ yet while sound is perceived, space also is perceived by the organ as sound's qualifying adjunct[3]. We have the notions as nearness and remoteness, etc These will prove the existence of space as a distinct substance The nearness and remoteness pertaining to space and those pertaining to time are found to come into being under more or less similar conditions, and to

1 अमनस्त्वे सति विभुत्वादात्मवदिति तत्प्रत्यक्षत्व ·· NTV, p 41.
2 दिक्कालावानुमेयावेव । परिमाण सयोगवियोगवन्तौ ··· NS, p 81.
3 रावे गृह्यमाणे तद्विशेषणतया दिगपि श्रोत्रेण ·· SD, p 139.

this extent they are alike They are however clearly distinguishable from each other For, when an old man is near us,— though on account of his nearness to us he is capable of being spoken of as near, yet the notion that he actually gives rise to is that of remoteness from us. Conversely, when an young man is at a distance from us,—even though this fact of his being at a distance renders him liable to be spoken of as remote, yet the notion that he actually gives rise to is that of nearness What happens in these cases is that the man who is near us in space is remote in point of time, and vise versa

The Nyāya and the Vaiśesika philosophers hold that there is one eternal ubiquitous space which is not open to perception, but it is only inferred from the spatial characteristics of nearness, remoteness, etc But spatial properties and relations like distance, size, etc , can be perceived directly through touch, sight, etc The Bhātta criticises this view on the ground that it is against experience, because space is perceived as content in the concepts of before, behind, etc , which are dependent solely on visual organ[1] Hence space should be accepted as perceivable Some Naiyāyikas also [like Jayanta], following the Bhātta, regard space as perceived by visual organ

Space is a ubiquitous substance Any limit that we set to space is therefore only a convenient fiction necessitated by purely pragmatic consideration Space is eternal, since it is an incomposite substance and does not depend on any thing for its existence And it is one It would therefore be wrong to suppose that corresponding to our ideas of directions as east, west, south, north, etc - ten in all–there are ten different spaces The distinctions of space are derived from its association with the limiting adjuncts [upādhi], in the form of east, west south, north and so on[2] Space in the direction of mount Udaya is known as east , in the direction of mount Asta is known as west , in the direction of mount Meru is known as north , in the direction opposite to mount Meru is known as south

1 दिशोऽपि पूर्वापरादिप्रत्ययाना नेत्रमात्राधीनत्वात् ··· MM, p 194.

2 दिशोऽपि पूर्वापराद्युपाधिवशात् भेदव्यवहारः । ibid, p 195

The Prābhākara, in agreement with the Vaiśeṣika, holds that space is inferred from the notions of priority and posteriority, and not directly those of mere remoteness and nearness Space is a ubiquitous, eternal, indivisible substance and possessed of the qualities of infinite magnitude, conjunction and disjunction Even though space is one, under certain conditions it comes to bear the terms like east, west, north and south

THE NATURE OF THE SOUL

The Materialist holds that the body itself is soul and no soul apart from the body Consciousness is an epiphenomenon of the body Consciousness is not found in the constituent elements of body individually like red colour in betel leaf, nuts and lime But it is found in the body due to a particular combination of the elements like red colour in the combination of betel leaf, nuts and lime[1] The Jaina maintains that living being is the soul Soul is the principal of vitality and life in the world. It persists throughout all the changes and is not the product of body In the growth of a soul from that of a child to that of a young man, there is no creation of a new or destruction of an old one It is a fusion of the old in the new. The essence of the soul is consciousness which underlines all the phenomenal changes of mind and body The Jaina accepts that even stones and metals have souls Regarding the consciousness in stones etc , he says that it is indormant state in them, whereas it is in waking state in other living beings The Buddhist believes that the soul is a mere bundle of sensations in a succession Soul as a mere succession of bits of sensations, ideas, emotions and desires, etc This succession is in perpetual movement and the feeling of identity or sameness of individuality is caused due to ignorance in exactly the same way in which a revolving fire stick gives the appearance of a red circle.

1 पृथिव्यप्तेजो वायुरिति तत्वानि । तत्समुदाये शरीरेन्द्रियविषयसञ्ज्ञा । तेभ्यश्चैतन्य किण्वादिभ्यो मदशक्तिवत् । Bṛhaspati sūtra.

The Sāṁkhya establishes the soul as pure spirit, different from body and unchangeable He argues that if it were liable to change, knowledge would be impossible As its character is consciousness it helps to bring the products of the evolutionary chain into self consciousness. It illuminates the entire sphere of thought and feeling The Naiyāyika recognizes some elements like desire, aversion, sympathy, awareness as non-corporeal ones These are not substances but the qualities of a substance which is named as soul The Naiyāyika proves its existence by means of inference Uddyotakāra, however, accepts perceptibility to the soul According to him, the object of the notion of 'I' is the soul Again the recognitions of different cognitions as mine proves the continued persistence of the soul Soul is a permanent spiritual substance endowed with pleasure, pain, cognition, desire, merit, and demerit However, consciousness is not its essence but an accident It acquires consciousness in conjunction with the body and the mind The Vedāntin says that the soul has empirical status but the soul [jīva] has not been granted any ontological reality Soul is pure consciousness, pure bliss but when the mind-body complex through illusion [avidyā] affects it, it becomes the soul [jiva] The soul is Bramhan

The question of existence of the soul has been treated most elaborately by Śabarasvāmin While discussing the Vedic sentence, 'The sacrificer equipped with the sacrificial utensils goes to heaven'[1], he says that the demonstrative pronoun looks like pointing to the actually perceived body as going to heaven , since the body is consumed in the fire, journey to heaven should not ascribed to the body , but only to the soul whose body this is The existence of the soul is inferred through the acts of breathing, etc One should not think that breathing, etc , belong to the body because they do not continue to exist as long as the body lasts[2]

The Buddhist holds that consciouness [vijñāna] alone is the soul Being self-effulgent it is sentient : knowledge,

1 स एष यज्ञायुधी यजमानोऽञ्जसा स्वर्गं लोक याति ।

2 ननु शरीरमेव प्राणिति अपानिति च । न, प्राणादय. SBh, 1-1-5.

pleasure, etc , are its various forms Śabara argues that this view is wrong, because the entity spoken of by the phrase 'he knows' [jānāti] is the nominative agent of the act of cognising, i e , the soul, not consciousness Hence it is proved that the eternal soul is different from momentary consciousness[1] The soul is an object of such perceptions as 'I know' and 'I am happy', etc The self is spoken of as 'self luminous' [ātmajyoti] in the Vedic sentence 'Herein the person is self-luminous'[2] which means that the self is cognised by itself, not by another self However, the self can be pointed out through analogy as follows— 'just as you perceive your own self, so on the same analogy, please understand that I also perceive that self in the same manner'[3]

Kumārila, following the **Bhāṣyakāra**, establishes that the self is distinct from the body, sense organs and vital forces Pārthasārathi explains that if there is no soul other than the body then the injunctions 'Let him sacrifice who wishes heaven' etc , are inexplicable unless there is one who is other than the body, who is fit to enjoy the things of the other world and who is the agent The self is not the sense organs because even after the sense organs are destroyed or the objects of sense organs are removed, we say that we have seen such thing If there was no soul, how could the synthetic presentation of the sensation through multifarious sense organs take place Thus the soul cannot be identified with the body and sense organs Though Śabara prefers to follow the Nyāya-vaiśeṣika arguments regarding the existence of, the soul Kumārila prefers the Sāṅkhya arguments He says that the aggregate of things must exist for the sake of another[4] Even as a bed which is an assemblage of different parts is for the use of the person who sleeps on it, so this world which is an assemblage of elements is for another's

1 यदि विज्ञानाऽन्यो नास्ति कोत्र हि 'जानाति' SBh, 1-1-5.
2 अत्राय पुरुष स्वय ज्योतिर्भवति Br Upa, 4-3-9.
3 उपमानाच्चोपदिश्यते – यादृश भवान्··· SBh, 1-1-5.
4 सङ्घातसन्निवेशो च न स्तः पारर्थ्यवर्ज्जितो SV, Atma, st 114.

use There is a self for whose enjoyment this enjoyable body and the rest has been produced

The Sānkhya holds that nature [prakrti][1] is the agent, and the soul [purusa] is unattached like the lotus leaf, but sentient. Kumārila criticises this view and says that the soul is not only knower and enjoyer but also active agent He regards the soul as the substrate of the entire gamut of mental phenomena, including pleasure, pain, desire, merit, demerit, etc The Naiyāyika holds that pleasure, etc , are the qualities of the soul but the Bhātta accepts these as the modifications of the self

Soul is the nature of knowledge and is known by itself It is a knower [jñātā], active agent [kartā] and enjoyer [bhoktā] Knowledge is its essence and attribute It is an attribute which determines its essence When the Śruti speaks of the self as a knower, knowledge is both the essence and an attribute of the self If it were not of the nature of knowledge as the Prābhākara holds, it would be insentient So the self is not mere knowledge Knowledge manifests an object It manifests itself as 'I' It is not manifested as such It is never manifested as mere knowledge It is manifested as 'I' in deep sleep also, since a person has the recollection in waking from sleep, 'I slept happily' The Prābhākara accepts that the soul is self-luminous or self-revealed Pārthasārathi criticises this view of the Prābhākara on the ground that self is absent during dreamless sleep, and agrees with the Naiyāyika in holding that the self is the object of I-consciousness or mental perception[2]

Prabhākara establishes the soul as distinct from the mind, sense-organs and body Śālikanātha says that the soul is different from mind [buddhi], because the latter is inert and absent during sleep and yet we have cognitions during sleep

1 Prakrti which is insentient, is constituted of three Gunas and is otherwise termed Pradhāna and it changes into the world form beginning with Mahat and ending with particulars.

2 तस्मादहं प्रत्ययगम्यो ज्ञाता SD, p. 123.

Nor can sense-organs be the soul, because in that case, there cannot occur the recollection 'I who saw the pot is the same I now touching' for, what was experienced by one in the past cannot be recollected by another. Therefore the soul is quite distinct from sense-organs Nor can the body be the soul, because the latter is cogniser and has consciousness If consciousness were a property of the body[1], we could not find bodies devoid of consciousness and there would be no reason for us to see dead bodies And the body is composed of various parts of earth If beyond the body there is no soul, then the moral law would be without any significance since no sin can pursue us in subsequent lives as the body is destroyed after death

The Prābhākara, following the Bhāṣyakāra, considers the self's knowledge itself as an object to be an absurdity, and, consequently, holds that there is no such thing as I-consciousness and that the self is known as the subject of all cognitions of objects The Bhātta denies self-lumination to the soul and holds that there is such thing I-consciousness and that the self is known as the object also. The Prābhākara argues that a cognition and a soul endowed with the quality of cognition are distinct from each other A soul is substratum while cognition is a quality

The Bhātta and the Prābhākara hold the Nyāya-Vaiśesika view of the self, but where as the Bhātta regards knowledge as the mode or activity of the self, the Prābhākara regards it as a quality of the self Śabara holds that the self is self luminous (known by itself nor by others) and the object of I consciousness The Bhāṭṭa while denying self-lumination to the soul holds that the self is known through 'I consciousness' The Prābhākara accepting self-lumination to the soul holds that there is no such thing as I consciousness

1 बुद्धीन्द्रियशरीरेभ्य भिन्न आत्मा विभुर्ध्रुव PP, p. 316.

THE SIZE OF THE SOUL

About the size of the soul, the Jaina says that the soul is of the size of the body The soul of an elephant must be larger than the soul of an insect He illustrates his conception of dimension of soul by saying that if soul was fixed in a certain corner of body, how could the entire body feel the touch Hence the soul must be co-extensive with the body On the death, the soul contracts and assumes the form of a seed to resume its future size according to the body given to it in next life

The Naiyāyika holds that the soul is infinite and unlimited in size It cannot be larger than the body because the body cannot hold a thing whose dimensions are larger than itself The soul cannot be smaller than the body because the spread of consciousness all over the body cannot be explained if consciousness is limited to a certain portion of it It cannot be of the same size because when a child is born, it should be small and when the child grows into man, the self cannot cope with the increasing dimensions of the body If the soul is changing with the body, then its functions of recognition and memory would be inexplicable The Sānkhya regards that the self is not of any finite size since then it would be made of parts and so be destructible It is not atomic since then it would not be in a position to cognise the affairs of the entire body The Advaita Vedāntin holds, on the part of the Śruti assertion i e , the soul is eternal and ubiquitous, that the soul is all-pervasive The Viśistādvaita Vedāntin says that the soul is atomic in size The soul departs by its nature on the distruction of its body The Veda also supports the view saying that the soul is atomic and knowable by the mind and being the hundredth part of the tip of a hair Though the soul is atomic and resides in the heart, it can experience sensations through the body or its attributive knowledge, like light, which can cxpand

In the Bhātta view, the soul is all-pervading, since its effects are found to be present everywhere and the Śruti asserts it to be eternal and ubiquitous It is pervasive, since its

knowledge, desire, volition, pleasure and pain are produced by objects in many places If it were atomic, it would not experience them everywhere. If it were assumed to move to objects in all places, the view would voilate the law of parcimony

The Jaina maintains that the soul is co extensive with its body. Kumārila refutes this view on the ground that the soul being itself immaterial, can never be mixed with material elements i e the body If it were co-extensive with its body, it would undergo increase and decrease with its body and it would become invested with parts, and it would be necessary to presume a multiplicity of parts and also presume that in the bodies of an insect and an elephant the whole of these parts which are neither more nor less would undergo extreme shrinkage and expansion[1] Such a postulation is not sound So it cannot be co-extensive with its body

The Viśiṣtādvaitavedāntin maintains that the soul is atomic. Kumārila refutes this view on the ground that if it were atomic, its qualities pleasure, pain, etc, would be experience only by that part of the body where the soul is located, and head-ache and pain in the foot, etc, would not be experienced simultaneously. The Śruti speaks of the size of a grain of corn, etc, of the soul in the sense that it is of extreme subtility, which has been elsewhere declared to be omnipresent[2] One should not think that it is of the size of the thumb, on the basis of Bhārata sentence, 'Yama pulled a person of the measure of the thumb from Satyavān's body'[3], because the sentence is to be taken as a laudatory passage [arthavāda]. And the same Vyāsa asserts it to be ubiquitous as follows 'The soul is eternal, omnipresent, eversteady and everlasting and all pervading'[4] It is ubiquitous and eternal So the doctrine of the atomic size of the soul is false

1 अथ शरीरपरिमित्त अर्हतपक्षेणाभ्युपगम्यते · TV, 2-1-2.
2 यदा ह्यणुमात्र आत्मा भवति तदा यावानेव·· ibid, 2-1-2
3 अङ्गुष्ठमात्र पुरुष निश्चकर्प बलाद्यम । MBh, Vana, 296.
4 नित्यः सर्वगत स्थाणुरचलोऽय सनातन. । BhG, 2-24.

THE DOCTRINE OF MANY SOULS

The Sāṃkhya lays stress on the numerical distinctness of the streams of consciousness as well as the individual unity of the separate streams If the self were one, all would attain freedom when one might become free The Vedāntin holds that the soul is one with God as the sparks issuing from fire are not different from the fire So the individual souls are not different from the supreme reality He argues that it is not possible that one can ever attain identity with another altogether distinct The Upanisads say that the knower of Brahman becomes Brahman. Hence the knower must be one with Brahman So the Vedāntin holds the identity of the self with the Brahman and the doctrine of the souls' difference due to limiting adjuncts

The Bhātta and the Prābhākara, in general agreement with the Sāṃkhya, accept the doctrine of many souls The Mīmāṃsaka gives his approval to the arguments given by the Sāṃkhya There are many selves, since experience shows that human beings are so much different from each other in physical might, intellectual attainment and moral perfection Thus there are many conscious beings in the world, each regarding the world in its own way and with an independent experience of its subjective and objective processes The various selves have different bodies and undergo separate births and deaths One goes to heaven and the other goes to hell If all the selves were one, all of them would have attained freedom when anyone attained emancipation

Pārthasārathi expounds the concept of many individual souls as follows. There are many souls with different cognitions, recollections and the like If the soul were one, Yajñadatta would recollect the object perceived by Devadatta From this, it is known that Yajñadatta's self is different from that of Devadatta because the former is not the substratum of the recollection of the latter's apprehension And one soul does not experience the pleasure or pain brought about by the Dharma or Adharma of another soul Thus the souls

are different from one another The difference of the mind alone cannot account for the difference in experiences determined by different bodies The difference of the souls alone account for the difference in their experiences The Śruti, the Smṛti and the Purāna texts speak of the singleness of the soul in the sense that the souls are similar to each other· The Śruti, and the Smṛti passages describe the plurality of the soul as follows, ' The Yogin freed from all desires attains the highest resemblance (with me)', 'They have attained to equality in attributes with me' and 'But the supreme person is another called the Supreme soul ' Pārthasārathi says that the scriptural passages which support monism should be interpreted as referring to the non-difference of the souls, otherwise it would lead a conflict with the scriptural passages which support pluralism As for the Śruti texts, like 'Thou art that', that teach oneness in the state of emancipation, they only speak of similarity [of the soul with Brahman] on account of (its) being free from pain, etc , as when a priest has accumulated great wealth, we say that he has become a prince[2]

THE CONCEPTOIN OF GOD

The Materialist does not accept any thing that is not perceived by the sense-organs Hence there is no acceptance of God. The Jaina does not recognize God He thinks that the existence of the universe could be explained without there being any creator God The Buddhist says that he cannot perceive any thing corresponding to the notion of God, no God exists But the Mahāyāna Buddhist believes in the existence of Ādi Buddha, an omnipresent God who can help man with his infinite compassion to attain Nirvāna The Hinayāna Buddhist regards Buddha merely as an example of Arhathood and thinks that this ideal stage

1 निरञ्जन परम साम्यमुपैति, मम साधर्म्यमागता:,
उत्तम पुरुषस्त्वन्य. BhG, 15-7, SD, p. 125.
तत्त्वमस्यादिश्रुतय पुरोहितोऽय राजा सवृत्त इतिवत् ।

can be attained without the help of Buddha or any super-worldly power The Sāṁkhya does not accept creator God He says that the world is not the result of any act of God, but is the product of an unending influence on Prakṛti The Yoga philosopher says that God is not the creator of the world God is a unique self, untouched by the taint of imperfection and above the law of action He suggests that devotion to God is an optional practice for those who would follow Yoga

The early Naiyāyikas and Vaiśeṣikas did not accept the existence of God It was not until a later period that Nyāya and Vaiśeṣika changed to theism, although neither ever went so far as to assume a creator of world. Later thinkers of these schools found it awkward to explain the world by the operation of Karma. The Naiyāyika proof of the existence of God consisted mainly of 1) an argument from innate reasoning in man, that when there is a pot, there must be a potter behind it as its maker , 2) an argument from the wonder of creation, namely, that no work of artistic skill is explicable otherwise than by an intelligence with its plan or design ; and 3) an argument from the authorship of the Vedas , Vedic truth contain unquestionable reality and by accepting those truths we attain happiness in life and salvation hereafter The suprarational truths cannot be perceived or inferred by man Hence the Veda must have been produced by God The Vedāntin says that God is Brahman, with the adjunct of Avidyā He creates and destroyes the world as a spider throws out and retracts its web Hence He is both the efficient and the material cause of the world

Kumārila criticises the Naiyāyika view that God creates the world like a weaver weaving a cloth and destroys it like a boy breaking a pot, as follows According to the maxim even a fool does not undertake an action without some purpose[1] every action must have some purpose But we cannot see any purpose in the creation and destruction

1 प्रयोजनमनुद्दिश्य न मन्दोऽपि प्रवर्तते । SV, sām, st 55.

the world by God Again if the world was created by God, then He must have a body. If He had a body then, that body could not have been created by Himself Admission of a body which is all-pervasive and intangible is unjustified, for, this is opposed to the ordinary notion of a body Since there cannot be an eternal body, even God must have His body created If another body is required to creat His body, then this will lead to an infinite regress If He is formless, then how could He have a desire to create the world? If He creates the world out of mercy, then there should be happiness everywhere Out of mercy and compassion, He cannot cause misery to the human beings If He creates, the world for his recreation [līlā] or his play, then, He cannot be regarded as one who has all desires fulfilled It cannot be understood how God without the help of any instruments or other accessories of any kind can create this world. If there were instruments apart from God, then we are caught in a duality of realities which contradicts with the supremacy of God

The Naiyāyikas and other philosophers accept that God is omniscient [sarvajña] The Jaina and the Buddhist say that Lord Mahāvīra and the great Buddha are omniscients Kumārila criticises the concept of omniscience as follows It is our experience that, with the visual organ, one cannot taste or smell or hear respectively The power of the sense-organ is restricted to certain objects even where some speciality is seen in respect of a potency. For, a man may possess very powerful eyesight able to see very small things or distant objects or he may be capable of smelling odours from a very great distance, but this does not mean that he is able to smell odours with his visual organ[1] The existence of omniscient is not proved by any means of right knowledge · The omniscient is not apprehended by any body. Nor is there any probans which could infer him Nor he is described by the Veda. The means of analogy cannot prove his

1 यत्राप्यतिशयो दृष्टः स स्वार्थातिलङ्घनात् ।
दूरसूक्ष्मादिदृष्टौ स्यान्न रूपे श्रोत्रवृत्तिता । ibid, Codanā, 114.

existence Because we do not see any such ominiscient person, we cannot think of similarity of unseen persons with Him And the so called omniscient person cannot teach Dharma [which is not described by the Veda] hence we cannot presume any body as omniscient The instruction of Dharma can be otherwise explained on the basis of the Veda One should not argue on the basis of Upaniṣad passages that omniscient exists because these passages are only laudatory passages

Kumārila says that there has not been a point of time when the order of the universe, as it exists today, was not in existence Hence, according to the Mimāmsaka, there is neither creation nor destruction of the world. Day to day creation and destruction are, however, acceptable to the Mīmāṁsaka The destruction of all product substances is known as the intermediary dissolution [avāntarapralaya] The destruction of all positive categories is known as the great dissolution [mahāpralaya] The Mīmāṁsaka does not accept the great dissolution of the world on the ground that if accepted ; that will lead to cessation of the existence of Veda which is the source of Dharma (merit) Even though Kumārila denies creator God, he accepts the super soul [paramātman] He declares, at the end of the chapter on the soul, that 'sound knowledge of the soul is to be obtained from the Vedānta'[1] This becomes further clear in one of the opening verses of SV in which he offers obeisance to God Śiva

The Prābhākara, like the Bhāṭṭa, criticises the Naiyāyika argument, i e , 'the creation and destruction of the world are the results of an agent, because they are the results of intelligent action, like the creation and destruction of a jar', and denies the great creation and utter dissolution of the world It should be understood that the Prābhākara endeavours to point out syllogistic process of the Naiyāyika only but does not dispute the existence of God Bhavanātha says 'It must not be misunderstood that by disowning complete dissolution, he does not believe in the existence of God'.

1 दृढत्वमेतद्विषयप्रबोध. प्रयाति वेदान्तनिषेवणेन । ibid, Ātmā, 148

This becomes further clear with the Prābhākara's statements. Bhavanātha says, 'The Prābhākara is not prepared to accept the Naiyāyika arguments on the existence of God, but not the existence of God'[1] Nandisvara says, 'Inferential existence of God has been challenged, and God is not denied'. Ravideva, the commentator of Nayaviveka, says, 'The existence of God has been established by the Srutis and the Smṛtis So any attempt to discard the existence of God will stand in direct opposition to the Vedic statements, and will transpire to be an unwarranted assertion[3]'

LIBERATION

The Materialist says that there is nothing like eternal bondage, rebirth and liberation [mokṣa] Dependence is, however, a relative bondage and independence is release Actually speaking, he says, liberation means death, since all kinds of misery disappear in death. He says that the life is full of pleasure and pain Because pleasure is mixed up with pain, we should not be frustrated to discard the pleasure in toto No body knows what is beyond this life Hence let us enjoy the world fully in this very life. The Bhāṭṭa criticises this view on the ground that the soul is quite distinct from the body and death is only for the body, not for the soul[4] The Jaina believes that the soul, in its purity, is infinite knowledge and bliss But our attachments and involvements go on accumulating Karma matter which veils the purity of the soul In the bondage stage, the soul acquires new qualities and thus suffers a continuous change though remaining the same in substance In the liberated stage the sufferings of the soul do not create any change in

1 एव चेश्वरे परोक्तमेवानुमान निरस्तम्, नेश्वरो ··· NV, p 199
2 एव चानुमानिकत्वमेवेश्वरस्य निराकृतम्, नेश्वरो · PV, p 82.
न चैव श्रुतिस्मृतिनिषिद्धेश्वरनिरासापत्या साधु बहिष्कार्यत्वापत्ति, NV p 199
4 ibid, 212

its form The man is Anantavīrya, while exercising his power he can overcome all Karma and finally become liberated Right faith, Right knowledge and Right conduct are essential to get liberation.

The Buddhist narrates four Noble truths: 1) There is suffering, 2) The suffering has a cause, 3) It can be eliminated and 4) There is a way to stop it Meditation on these four Noble truths leads man to liberation [Nirvāna] One who wants to get liberation, should follow the eight fold path, 1) Right belief, 2) Right aspiration, 3) Right speech, 4) Right conduct, 5) Right mode of liveilehood, 6) Right effort, 7) Right mindedness, and 8) Right rapture Nirvāna is the elimination of passions and desires to liberate the mind of its attachments The Bhāṭṭa refutes this view on the ground that series of cognitions remain by itself devoid of context, also because, the series of cognitions are intermittently being produced and destroyed moment after moment, the experience of the fruit, liberation, by any one, is unintelligible[1].

The Naiyāyika describes liberation as the absolute cessation of the twentyone forms of pain. These are 1) the body (2-7) the six sense organs (8-13) the six objects of the sense organs (14-19) the six cognitions obtained through the sense organs (20-21) pleasure and pain. Pleasure is called pain in the same manner as honey mixed with poison is called poison Through the true knowledge of the sixteen categories viz Pramāṇa, etc, a person is able to remove his misapprehension and also able to acquire true knowledge of the reality The person with knowledge gets detachment with the worldly things and stays in his own natural condition, i e, free from all the qualities, i.e, cognition, pleasure, pain, volition, merit and demerit The Bhāṭṭa denies this view on the ground that if liberation consists in the state of blisslessness then it would not be object of human pursuit [purusārtha], and no one desires to get such senseless state of stone like existence[2].

1 ibid p. 213. 2 ibid, p. 213.

The Sāmkhya regards the knower as the self [puruṣa] and the known as the nature [prakrti] The self is defined as pure spirit, different from the body and the nature. The self is inactive but it identifies itself with the activities of the nature through egoism. Then the intellect [buddhi] comes into contact with the objects through the senses and assumes the form of the objects, etc The intellect is reflected in the self and the self is reflected in the intellect The self, though it remains aloof from the intellect, falls, into the misconception of identifying itself with the intellect and of ascribing the states of the latter to itself Realization of the truth that the self is different from the intellect leads to liberation Puruṣa's release from the cluches of nature and from all kinds of passions is liberation. The Śruti 'the soul should be known' asserts that the discriminative knowledge of Prakṛti and the soul leads to liberation.

The arguments of Kumārila against this view is as follows Knowledge does not annul the past Karma. The past karma should be experienced. Only experience can clear the past karma Knowledge being purely negative in character, can stop only further karmic residua, and not entire karma And there is no Vedic revelation on the point that the knowledge leads to liberation. Hence knowledge is not the means to liberation. The Śruti 'the soul should be known' asserts about the knowledge viz. that the soul is distinct from the body, which is said to help man to perform the sacrifices whose results accrue to the man in another birth[1].

The yoga philosopher says that the eight fold path frees a man from mental attachments and destroys ignorance, the cause of bondage and suffering Practice and non-attachnment are the necessary steps for accomplishing yogic sādhanā so that the fluctuating tendency of the human mind may be brought under control. Isolation of self from mind and its modes is liberation.

1 आत्मा ज्ञातव्य इत्येतन्मोक्षार्थं न च चोदितम् ।
कर्मप्रवृत्तिहेतुत्वमात्मज्ञानस्य लक्ष्यते ॥ SV, Sambandha, st. 103

The Vedāntin describes liberation as the cessation of the world i e of Saṁsāra Nescience creates the world The soul is the substratum behind all the psychical status Likewise Brahman is also the substratum of all objectivity This is why sensient beings like beetles emerge from insensient things like cowdung and insensient things like nails and hair grow out of sensient human beings If we posit two paralalled realities, one explaining the consciousness and the other explaining unconscious objectivity, we have to face an irreconcilable dualism Hence the knowledge of Brahman [identity of Brahman and the soul] is the only solution to reconcile nescience The Vedāntin quotes the Śruti 'For where there is duality, as it were, there one sees another, where verily, everything has become just one's own self, then whereby and whom would one see…[1]', supporting this view Pārthasārathi interprets the Śruti in the sense of absence of outside relation to the soul and says that the cessation of the world is not liberation, but the dissolution of the world contact, because the world is not created by nescience According to the Mīmāmsaka, the world is real and eternal The world binds man in three ways Through 1) the body, which is the abode of pleasure, etc, 2) the sense organs, which are instruments of pleasure, etc, and 3) the objects, which are fit to be enjoyed

The Saṁsāra is the chain of causation in a cyclic order, which leads to bondage, suffering, extinction, birth, attachment, frustration and repeated sufferings In this chain of causation, some causes refer to past life, 1) the acts done in the past, whose consequences the man must suffer in the present life, the karmas to expiate which one has taken the present birth They are the ripe [prārabdha] karmas Some causes are due to present life, 2) the karmas done in the past, but which are not ripe, and will have to be expiated in some future life. They are the stored [sañcita] Karmas. And some causes lead

1 यत्र हि द्वैतमिव भवति तदितर इतरं पश्यति यत्र त्वस्य सर्वमात्मैवाभूत्तत्केन कं पश्येत् । [Br. UP. 2-4-14] SD, p. 125.

to future life 3) The karmas which a man creates in one's present life, and which have to be expiated in future They are the fresh [āgāmi] Karmas Of these, the fresh Karmas can be stopped, by doing every action in a spirit of service Even the ripe karmas can be expiated while undergoing such experiences But the stored Karmas, which are unripe to yield their fruit, will not free the Sādhaka from their clutches and the Sādhaka is not ready to wait for future lives in order to get rid of them.

Kumārila says that the past Karma can be stopped by performing the rites without any intention. The smṛti text, 'performance of one's duty without attachment to action fruits constitutes both Yoga and renunciation[1]' also supports this view The rites are of four kinds, viz. optional (kāmya), prohibited [niṣiddha], regular [nitya] and occasional [naimittika] Those which fulfil the desires for worldly happiness and heavenly happiness are called optional rites Those which are prohibited by the Veda and whose practice leads man to hell are prohibitory rites The Agnihotra, isti, etc , are regular rites, since the Śruti texts like, 'one should perform the Agnihotra as long as one lives' and 'one should perform the homa in the evenings' and 'one should perform the homa in the mornings'[2] we know that such rites are to be unfailingly performed every evening and morning by a person as long as one lives. The Pathikṛd isti, occasioned by the non-performance of the New-moon-day and Full-moon-day sacrifices at the proper time, and such other rites are occasional rites, as we know from the Vedic texts like, 'One should offer puroḍāsa, baked on eight potsherds, to Path-maker Agni'[3]

Of these rites, the seeker of liberation should not perform optional rites and also should not commit prohibited actions Both these makes him struggle with Karmic residua

1 अनाश्रित कर्मफल कार्यं कर्म करोति यः । Bh, G, 6-1.

2 यावज्जीवमग्निहोत्र जुहोति , साय जुहोति ; प्रातर्जुहोति ।
TBr, 2-2-7-8

3 अग्नये पथिकृते पुरोडाशमष्टाकपाल निर्वपेत् । TBr, 1-4-4-10.

And he should perform regular and occasional rites without fail, because the negligence of both the rites leads to demerit [pratyavāya][1] Hence regular and occasional rites should be performed by all to avoid the sins of omission Regarding the result of regular and occasional rites, the Prābhākaras say that non-performance of these rites inevitably leads to demerit, but their performance produces no result The Bhāṭṭa say that the destruction of demerit itself is the result of their performance

Both merit [punya] and demerit [pāpa] are unfavourable for liberation Merit and demerit lead man to happiness and misery respectively. So, both merits and demerits should be destroyed by the constant performance of regular and accasional duties with detachment i e as duties, which produce neither merit nor demerit The seeker of liberation should discard desires and, also for that, optional and prohibited rites which lead to bondage Thus, the ascetic is free from merit and demerit, because he performs regular and occasional duties without fail Since he does not perform optional rites, the future merits (which result from the performance of optional rites), will not eventuate Since he avoids prohibited rites, the future demerits (which result from the performance of prohibited actions) will not eventuate Because the causes that help one's taking on the body are absent, one remaining disembodied when the body already acquired falls, attains liberation[2].

The Bhāṭṭa's view on the place of knowledge in the scheme of the means to liberation, may now be discussed Kumārila is favourably disposed to Samyoga-prthaktva-nyāya or the principle of two-in-oneness, according to which, the knowledge of self serves two functions, viz., being 1) helpful to the sacrifice [kratvartha] 2) helpful to man [purusārtha] Because unless one has the knowledge that the soul is different from

1 मोक्षार्थी न प्रवर्तेत तत्र काम्यनिषिद्धयो ।
नित्यनैमित्तिके कुर्यात्प्रत्यवायजिहासया ।। SV, Saṁbandha, 110.

2 असति शरीरारम्भे पूर्वशरीरनिपाते ··· SD, p. 130.

the body one, cannot undertake the performance of sacrifices whose results are said to accrue to the person in another birth And the Śruti texts, "the self free from all evil is to be sought after " 'one should worship the self[1] etc, reveal that the knowledge of self will give the fruit of all the eight perfections of Yoga And the Śruti, 'passing his life thus he, after death, reaches the regions of Brahma, and from there he never returns[2]' asserts that liberation can be found through due knowledge of the self Thus according to Samyoga-pṛthaktva, knowledge is conducive not only to sacrifice, but also to man

Kumārila's intention is that the knowledge which the Sāṃkhya system enjoins, is of no value to the attainment of liberation, but meditation on the self (cf ātmānam upāsīta) is indispensible for one who longs for liberation. Pārthasārathi clearly says that for liberation both knowledge and ritual practice are essential He recognises the value of knowledge as an aid to liberation It is known by the name jñāna-karma-samuccaya Nārāyana holds that not only knowledge but also the path declared in the Vedānta should be followed by the seeker of truth[3] The Vedāntin also accepts the jñāna-karma-samuccaya-vāda and in the view of Maṇḍana the means to liberation (i e, jñāna-karma-samuccaya) consists in the combination of repeated contemplation of the indirect knowledge of the secondless absolute derived from the Upaniṣadic Śabda and also the ritualistic discipline of the prescribed sacrifices and such other rites[4]

The author of Sarvasiddhāntasamgraha speaks of the Bhaṭṭa as upholder of the view of liberation as a state of happiness His statement is as follows: 'In the state of final deliverance, there occurs, even in the absence of the objects of the senses, the experience of the highest bliss Through this experience of eternal bliss, all those who are desirous of the

1 य आत्माऽपहतपाप्मा ··· बोद्धव्यः ··· तथाऽऽत्मानमुपासीत ।
2 स सर्वांश्च लोकान् ··· न स पुनरावर्तते – TV, 1-3-8 p. 28.
3 कुर्वाणस्यात्ममीमांसा वेदान्तोक्तेन वर्त्मना । MM, p. 217.
4 Br. Siddhi, pp, 2-3 . see also int. p xxxiii.

final release, become freed from attachment to the objects of the senses, and reach that condition of final deliverance from which there is no returning'[1] Raghunātha śiromani refers to the Bhātṭa view on liberation as a state of happiness and refutes it Nārāyana, the author of MM, describes liberation as a state of happiness : 'When there is the absolute routing out of misery, the mental experience of the happiness that already existed in the soul is said to be liberation by the Bhātṭa'[2] But the Bhāttas, except Nārāyana, do not accept liberation as a state of happiness. Pārthasārathi criticises this view of experience of bliss in liberation and says that liberation consists in the state of cessation of misery Gāgābhāṭṭa, the author of Bhāttacintāmani, rejects this view of liberation as a state of happiness Hence liberation, according to the Bhāṭṭa, is not of the nature of positive bliss, but is a mere negative state of being free from misery.

The Prābhākara believes, like the Bhātta, that Saṁsāra is a beginningless series of births and deaths Action produces consequences which are either merit or demerit There is no escape from the consequence of action The worldly pleasure such as is derived, from hearing songs, love-embrace, sight of the moon, tasting sweets, scenting fragrance, etc , is ephemeral and connected with pain The quest for release from pain frustrates a person in life and this leads to go beyond and transcend the limitations of one's empirical existence[3] The cycle of births and rebirths will have to be checked in order to attain this end Disintersted performance of duties is the means of liberation

So, the seeker of liberation should discard optional and prohibited rites, which are cause for heaven and hell. He should perform regular and occasional rites whose non-performance produces sins of ommission of the rites He should perform regular and occasional duties with detachment. While undergoing experiences of results of merit and demerit, he becomes

1 Sarvasiddānta sangraha, p. 38. 2 MM, p. 215.

3 यः खलु सासारिकेभ्यो दुःखेभ्य उद्विग्नः, तबनुषङ्गबलेभ्यश्च सुखेभ्योऽपि विगतस्पृहो मोक्षायोपतिष्ठते ··· PP, p. 341.

free from karmic residua While practising the knowledge of self along with mind control, sense-restraint, etc , he will attain the state of liberation, which is described by the śruti text, 'He never returns to this world of Samsāra' as unreturnable to the ditch of Samsāra

The Prābhākara, like the Bhāṭṭa, describes liberation as a state in which there is no pain This becomes further clear with these references . Śivāgrayogin says that according to the Prābhākara, liberation consists in the state of total disappearance of pain[1] Gāgābhaṭṭa refers to the definition of the Prābhākara on liberation as follows : 'The prāgabhāva—absence before appearance—of pain along with the total absence of pain[2]'. Nārāyana describes the doctrine of the Prābhākara that there is release when the soul remains in its own nature, after all the specific qualities like knowledge are destroyed[3]

MIND

The word Manas (mind) might have been derived from the root 'Manu avabodhane' or 'Manu jñane'. From the meaning of the root 'Man' and from the experienee of the workings and activities of mind we can say that mind is the abode of all knowledge gained by organs Mind can remember past things when it comes up to the level of those things It is the experience of every body that on remembers past things when the mind comes up to the level of the past times when they took place The mind has many cells to collect past as well present experiences and knowledge of things of the world

Mind is described by Kumārila as a sense-organ which apprehends pleasure, etc Nārāyana defines it as follows :

1 आत्यन्तिकदु·खानुत्पादो मोक्ष इति गुरव । S, Bh p 475.
2 आत्यन्तिकदु खप्रागभावो मोक्ष इति प्राभाकरा· । Bh, C, p 42.
3 सकलबुद्ध्यादि विशेषगुणविलये सत्यात्मनः
स्वरूपावस्थानम् मोक्ष इति प्राभाकरमतम् । MM p. 214.

"Mind is the internal organ, assumed to be a sense organ as the means for the direct experience of happiness etc , all-pervasive in size, and motionless '[1] The assumption of the mind as a sense organ is made to explain subjective experience

There is a rather interesting controversy between the Bhāṭṭa and other schools about the size of mind. The Vedāntin accepts mind is of medium size [madhyama parimāna] , thus it can assumes the shape of any object under its consideration It traverses through the channel of the sense-organ to grasp the object and assumes its shape In the perception of a pot, e g , the mind assumes the form of the pot This stage of the mind assuming the form of the object is called Vrtti, In grasping the object far away from the visual organ, the mind takes a journey via the route marked by the sense organs, as the water of a tank, going out through a hole, and entering fields through channels, comes to have, even like those fields, a quadrangular, or other figure[2]. The Bhāṭṭa refutes the Vedantin's view on the ground that if mind is presumed to be of intermediary magnitude, then, it will become non-eternal

The Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika and the Prābhākara say the mind is of atomic size. Their argument is as follows. If the mind has been possessed of magnitude, it could have come in contact with many sense organs at a time so that many knowledges could have taken place simultaneously As many knowledges are never produced at once, the mind must be admitted to be atomic. The Bhāṭṭa refutes this view on the ground that if it be atomic, it would follow that in the case of happiness, present on the body and produced by sandal paste, there could not arise the experience as simultaneous , this establishes the size of the mind as all-pervading.

1 मनसस्त्विन्द्रियत्वेन प्रत्यक्षा धीस्सुखादिषु ।
मनसा सप्रयुक्तो हि तान्यात्मा प्रतिपद्यते ॥ SV, pra, st. 83.
सुखाद्यपरोक्ष्यसाधनेन्द्रियत्वेन कल्प्य ··· MM, p. 217.

2 तत्र यथा तटाकोदकं छिद्रान्निर्गत्य कुल्यात्मना केदारान्प्रविश्य चतुष्कोणाद्याकार भवति ··· VP, p. 13.

The Naiyāyika says that if mind is presumed to be all-pervading, then there will occur no cognisability on account of the absence of the non-intimate cause that brings about the contact between the soul and mind. The Bhāṭṭa refutes this view and says that it has been established that for space, ether, etc, though all pervading, there is a reciprocal contact, which is of their very nature, in the form 'the eastern sky', 'the western sky'. And there are syllogisms :— "Two all pervading substances have reciprocal contact, because while they are substances neither producible nor producing, there is no intermediate space, like a jar" 'Ether is in contact with time, because, while it is distinct from time, there is no intermediate space, like a jar'[1]. And that our experience is inconclusive and cannot be said to be such as would rule out the possibility of several knowledges arising at the same time.

The Prābhākara, like the Naiyāyika, establishes the mind on the grounds of succession in experience and experiencing thoughts and feelings as follows The soul being all-pervading, there is no reason why things should be known in succession. This succession of knowledge can be explained by the fact that knowledge is got by the movement of mind, which now connects with this thing, and now with that, and this enables the soul to know things one after another Then again it is observed that the soul is conscious of not only the sensible objects, such as colour, odour, and so on, but also pleasure and pain, that is to say, of the objects of the nature of feeling And, if in the case of every one of the sense objects, the soul has to use an organ, by means of which alone, it can perceive its object, it is only reasonable to infer that, in the case of the objects of other classes also, of which the soul is conscious, it has to use a sense organ So the mind is needed as a sense organ for experiencing thoughts, feelings and so on

This mind, in each sentient being, is only one as indicated by the fact that we can be conscious of things in succession

1 विभुनो द्रव्ये परस्परसंयोगिनी अनारम्भ्यारम्भकद्रव्यत्वे सति निरन्तरत्वाद् घटवत्। MM, p 221

There must be an infinite number of minds, as there are an infinite number of souls, one in each experiencing entity The mind is atomic. If mind is presumed to be all-pervading, then there will occur no cognisability on occount of the absence of the non-intimate cause that brings about the contact between the soul and mind Nor can it be argued 'Let there be contact between two all-pervading substances What is wrong with it ?' Because, if this view is accepted, the occurance of absolute absence of deep sleep has to be accepted in as much as the contact between two all-pervading substances is eternal. The contact of soul and mind always exists except in a small region of the nerve centre The mind can enter the nerve centre only if it is of atomic size, and cause sleep When the mind emerges out of the nerve centre, cognition arises , this establishes the size of the mind is atomic[1] Even some of the Bhāṭtas, like Mandana miśra[2], Vācaspati miśra[3] and others, accept that the mind is of atomic size

The Bhāṭṭa accepts the mind as all pervading, thus differs from the Prābhākara and the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika view of it as atomic. The Prābhākara, in agreement with the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika, accepts the mind as atomic, but would not accept the view that the soul is the object of mental perception.

SOUND

The Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika holds that sound is produced by conjunction, by disjunction and by sound[4]. The first kind of sound is produced by the contact of stick with drum , the splitting sound that is produced when a bamboo is halved, is the second kind of sound , all subsequent sounds reaching the ear from the place where the sound is produced first, is the third

1 अणुत्वमेव तस्य द्रव्यस्याश्रियते । PP, p 149.
2 मनोभूलपरिस्पन्द आत्मनस्तत्प्रयत्नजः । BhV, st. 49.
3 इन्द्रियभावस्त्वणुन एव मनसः " Nyāyakanikā.
4 संयोगाद्वा विभागाद्वा शब्दनिष्पत्तिः । VS, 2-2-3.

kind of sound. The production of sound series takes place in the manner of waves or in the manner of Kadamba buds. Thus, at the first step, sound, such as 'ka' is produced by the conjunction of the throat, etc From the first sound, another sound covering the ten quarters, is produced by the very sound By that, another sound enveloping it is produced In this order sound is produced in the ear, when it is perceived So, sound in the alphabetic form is also transitory. The notion that "the sound 'ka' is produced, and the sound 'ka' is destroyed" also supports this view. The recognition that 'this is that ka' apprehends only its belonging to the same class, as we notice expressions like, 'The very medicine that I made was made by another also'

Kumārila criticises this view on the ground that it will create many unverifiable assumptions—heard sound is different from the said one, acceptance of multiplicity of sounds, sound creates another sound similar to it, and so on[1]. And we can see many wrong assumptions in this view as follows:— The first sound is produced through the conjunction of throat, etc, remaining sounds are produced through the first sound, the sounds other than the last are destroyed by the sound wave next to itself, and the last one is destroyed by itself So, to remove all the mistakes better to accept the theory of eternality of the letters Śābara puts forth the manifestation of sound as follows The air particles disturbed by the sound provoking stroke strike against the stagnant air-particles and produce conjunctions and disjunctions (ripples) on all sides, which go on spreading as long as the momentum lasts,— the conjunction and disjunction (ripples) are not perceived because the air is imperceptible, and as for the sound, it is heard only so long and so far as the ripples do not cease, and after they have ceased, the sound is not heard. Thus there is no incogruity at all, It is for this same reason that the sound is heard at a greater distance when the wind is favourable So, when a person wishes to express something, the air inside the body is moved out of one's mouth. This air

1 अदृष्टकल्पना तस्मिन्पक्षे बह्वी प्रसज्यते । SV, Śabda ni. st 90.

is helped by the conjunction and disjunction of one's palate, tongue, etc, manifests the sounds[1] So, sound in the form of alphabatic is eternal but only the audible sound [dhvani] is transitory[2].

The Grammarian says sound is neither letter nor sound [dhvani]. It is 'Sphota' manifested by the letter or sound. That is, the sound and the letter are the suggestors of the suggested Sphoṭa E g., that by manifesting which through conglomeration of the letters 'ghatah' the idea of pot is obtained, is śabda or Sphota However, in usage, the term sound denotes letters or sound [dhvani] This is to be understood only in a secondary sense So sound is Sphota only. Pārthasārathi rejects the Sphota theory by the proof of non-perception Because of its non-perception it is concluded that Sphoṭa has no factual existence. He says that in ordinary usage the mental inpressions are reminders of past experience and here they bring to mind the previous Varnas which together with that heard last, manifest the sense, where as according to the Grammarian the mental impressions manifest Sphoṭa— this function of theirs is unverifiable assumption[3]. So this should not be accepted

The Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika accepts sound as a quality of ether. The Bhātta rejects this view on the ground that it is perceived independently of a substratum One of the criteria of quality is that it is perceived invariably as dependent upon a substance It is only a substance which is independently and directly perceived and which can exist as a self subsistent real Thus the criterion of quality being found lacking, and its affinity with substance being clearly observable, it stands to reason that sound should be accepted as a substance[3] It is all-pervasive. Here the inferences are as follows 'Sound is all-pervasive, because it is an intangible substance' and 'Sound is all-pervasive, because it is substance without parts, like soul'.

1 अभिघातेन हि प्रेरिता वायवस्तिमितानि ··· SBh, 1-1-13
2 प्रयत्नाभिहतो वायुः कोष्ठचो यातीत्यसशयम् ।
स सयोगविभागौ च ताल्वादेरनुरुध्यते । SV, Śabda ni st 122.
3 न सस्कारान्तर कल्पयितव्यम् · SD p. 94.

The sound is eternal. Here the syllogism is as follows :—'Sound is eternal, because while it is existent, it has no cause, like ether' So is established its eternality The notions 'The sound 'ka' is produced and the sound 'ka' is destroyed' are conditioned by the existence and non-existence of the proximity of a manifester, so these do not sublate the eternality of sound The recognition 'This is that 'ka' ' also proves the eternality of sound So articulate sound is eternal.

The Prābhākara, like the Bhāṭṭa, accepts eternality of sound Śālikanātha criticises the Nyāya Vaiśesika, view–i e sound is transitory and establishes that sound is eternal [1] He says that the notions, 'The ga is orginated, and the ga is destroyed' should be understood in the meaning of the audible sound [dhvani] manifesting the letter. The recognition 'this is that ga' is also establishes the eternality of sound Only the difference between the Bhāṭṭa and the Prābhākara regarding sound is the farmer accep's it as a independent substance and the latter establishes it as a quality of the substance ether.

QUALITY

BHĀTTA VIEW

The second of the categories is Guṇa or quality. A quality cannot exist independently by itself like substance It exists in a substance which is its substrate. It is non-material cause of things insofar as it determines only their nature and character, but not their existence The Bhāṭṭa defines it as quality is that which while being distinct from action, has sub-genuses and is excluded from material+cause [2] According to the Mīmāṃsakas sub-genus resides in three categories, viz , substance, quality and action. The definition ' which has sub-

1 अन्येत्वाहु:- सयोगाद्विभागाद्वाऽऽच्चरशब्दो.. PP p 356

2 कर्मणो व्यतिरिक्तत्वे सत्यवान्तरजातिमान् ।
उपादानत्वनिर्मुक्तो गुणो गुणविदा मत. ॥ MM, p 244

genus' would therefore cover all the three, and hence it is restricted to the quality by expressly excluding substance[1] and action. The Bhāṭṭas establish twentyfore qualities, viz., colour (Rūpa), taste (Rasa), smell (Gandha), touch (sparśa), number (Saṃkhyā), dimension (Parimāṇa), individuality (Prthaktva), conjunction (Samyoga), disjunction (Vibhāga), remoteness (Paratva), proximity (Aparatva), gravity (Gurutva), fluidity (Dravatva), Viscidity (Sneha), knowledge (Buddhi), pleasure (Sukha), pain (Duḥkha), desire (Icchā), aversion (Dvesa), effort (Prayatna), faculty (Saṃskāra), audible sound (Dhvani), manifestedness (Prākatya), and potency (Śakti)

The Logicians also accept twentyfour qualities, but they replace audible-sound, manifestedness and potency with sound, virtue (Dharma), and vice [Adharma]. According to the Bhāṭṭa sound is a substance, not a quality.[2] Virtue and vice are, according to the Logician, the two varieties of unseen result [Adrṣta] and imply two positive things and popularly known as merit [Punya] and demerit [Pāpa] and causes for one's enjoyment and sufferings respectively. The unseen result [Adrsta] produced by souls which bring about the cosmic order and unable the selves to reap the harvest of their pas tactions The movement of the magnetic needle towards the magnet, the circulation of moisture in plants, the upwards nation of fire & original movements of the atoms are all assigned to this mysterious principle It is this principle which adds a spiritual character to the pluralistic realism of the Logician and robs it of its scientific flavour

Kumārila criticises the Logician view and says that the word virtue [Dharma] is not found used in respect of merit man's quality, Pudgala etc. Nor can it be known from scriptu-

1 Substance is material cause for the quality or activity which is produced in it.

2 Supra, p. 110

res to be instrumental to the human goal.[1] Similarly the word vice also. The unseen result (Adrsṭa) is nothing distinct from the mere potency.[2] The Bhāṭṭa establishes that sacrifice is a virtue as instrumental to prosperity It is understood from the world as well as from the Veda. Similarly cruelty, etc, are vice, as instrumental to falling in to hell etc Sacrifice, cruelty, etc, are of the nature of substances, qualities, or actions. Therefore virtue and vice are included in them.

The qualities that belong to eternal substances are called eternal and those of transient ones, transient Those that subsist in two or more substances jointly are said to be general (Sāmānya), while those reside in one substance only at one time, and not in two or more substances conjointly are said to be specific (Viśesa) Number, dimention, distinctnes, conjunction, disjunction, remoteness, nearness, derived fluidity, gravity, velocity, manifestedness and potency are general qualities. while colour, taste, smell, touch, viscidity, natural fluidity, knowledge, pleasure, pain, desire, aversion, effort faculty and audible sound are specific qualities which help to distinguish objects which posses them from others

Qualities can be divided into 1) those which can be perceived through one external sense-organ vig, colour, taste smell, touch and audible sound,2) those which can be perceived through two external sense-organs eyes and the skin, viz, number, size, distinctness, conjunction, disjunction, remoteness, nearness, fluidity viscidity and manifestedness and 3) those which cannot be perceived through any sense-organ, viz. gravity, faculty and potency The qualities of the self except knowledge, i e pleasure, pain, desire, aversion, volition are perceived through the mind (Manas)

1 पुद्गलेषु च पुण्येषु नृगुणो पूर्वंजन्मनि ।
प्रयोगो धर्मशब्दस्य न दृष्टो न च साधनम् ॥
पुरुषार्थस्य ते ज्ञातु शक्यन्ते चोदनाविभि । SV, I I I

2 S V. Dharma V. 197

Colour (Rūpa), a special quality perceived by the visual organ only, resides in earth, water, light and darkness. White colour, which is not brilliant, is in water, brilliant white is in light, black colour is in darkness and all the five colours, viz, white, black, yellow, red and blue are found in earth[1] The Logicians accept composite colour as a distinct one on the grounds that the aggregate that is made up of parts comprising blue, yellow and other colours produce a distinct colour called composite The Bhāttas however, reject the composite eolour theory and say that in the aggregate there is a variety of colours covering only a part of it

Taste (Rasa) is the special quality of things apprehended only by the gustatory organ Earth and water have taste The tastes of earthly substances are due to the application of heat and are of six kinds, viz, sweet (Madhura), sour (Amla), salty (Lavana), punjent (Katu), astringent (Kaṣāya) and bitter (Tikta) The taste of water is sweet and not produced by the application of heat

Smell (Gandha) is the specific quality which is apprehended by the olfactory organ only It resides in earth and is of three kinds, viz, fragrant, noxious and ordinary The appearence of smell in water, etc, is due to the association of earth[2]

Touch (Sparśa) is the special quality which is apprehended by the tactual organ. It resides in earth, water, light and air There are three kinds of touch— hot, cold and neither hot nor cold Cold is in water. Hot is in light. Neither hot nor cold touch in earth and air.

Number (Samkhyā) is a general quality, by virtue of which we use the terms ‘one, two, three, etc’ Of these

1 तच्च शुक्ल-कृष्ण-पीत-रक्त-श्यामभेदेन पञ्चविधम् । एतेषामवान्तरभेदा: पुनरसख्या. । MM, p. 245

2 स च सुगन्ध-दुर्गन्ध-साधारणगन्धभेदेन त्रिविध· जलादौ गन्धप्रतिभान तु पृथिवीससर्गात् । ibid p. 245

numbers unity is eternal in ternal substances and etransient in transient substances, while other numbers are transients only.

Dimension (Parimāna) is that general quality of things due to which we are able to measure the things as great or small, long or short It is eternal in eternal substances and transient in transient things The sky has extremely large dimension where as an atom has the smallest dimension

Individuality (Pṛthaktva) is the basis of distinctions among things It is a general quality and exists in all the substances The Prābhākaras do not accept it in produced substances 1 The Bhāṭṭas reject this view on the grounds that the knowledge of difference has to be accepted to even in respect of produced substances[2].

The Vaiśeṣikas do not accept individuality in eternal substances. According to them, particularity (Viśeṣa) applies to them. Praśastapāda holds that particulartty is an independent category residing in eternal substances distinguishing them from one another All the empirical objects are composed of parts which are further made of smaller parts or atoms All these atoms are alike in their general characteristics, shape, dimension, colour and weight How do then we distinguish tone atom from another atom ? It is this principle of particularity which ensures the separate existence of the atoms The Bhāṭtas the Prābhākaras, the Naiyāyikas and Vedāntins are apposed to accept particularity as a necessary condition of individuality and establish individuality even in eternal substances to distinguish from one another.

Conjunction (Samyoga) is a general quality existing in all substances. It is of two kinds, viz , eternal and non-eternal.

1 पृथक्त्व तु गुणो नित्यद्रव्यषु परमाणुषु ।
भवेद्व्यावर्तको धर्म कार्यद्रव्येषु नेष्यते ॥
Padārtha Dīpika Quoted in MM p 247

2 कार्यद्रव्येष्वपि भेदप्रतिपत्ते .. MM, p 247

Of these, the reciprocal conjunction of ether, time etc, which are eternal and all-pervasive, is eternal The Prābhākaras and the Logicians do not accept eternal conjunction and establish inherence in that place. The Bhātta, however reject inherence and establish eternal-conjunction in that place Non-eternal conjunction is of two kinds[1] 1) conjunction is brought about by motion of one thing, as when a flying kite comes in to contract with a fixed post and 2) due to the motion of both the things joined, as when two fighting rams butt against each other[2]

Disjunction (Vibhāga) refer to the separation of things which were in union. It subsists in two substances disjoined It is of three kinds- 1) due to the movement of one of the things disjoined, e g., the flying away of a kite from a fixed pole, 2) due to the movement of both the things disjoined, e g , moving away of two wrestlers fighting with each other, and 3) due to another disjunction, e g , separation of a body from a tree due to disjunction of hand from a tree

Remoteness (Paratva)[3] and Proximity (Aparatva) the specific qualities are the basis of the notions of remote and near These, exist only in space and time Each of them is of two kinds, spatial and temporal

Gravity (Gurutva) is the special quality of things by which they tend to fall to the ground Falling is due to gravity

1 सयोग सर्वद्रव्यवर्ती सामान्यगुण । स च नित्यानित्यभेदेन द्विविध ।
ibid p 251

2 Nārāyana, the author of MM, following the Logicians division, accepts third kind also conjunction brought about by another conjunction, when as we write on a paper with a pen, the conjunction of pen with paper also means a conjunction of hand with the paper. ibid. p. 251

3 परव्यवहारसाधारणकारण परत्वम् ibid, p. 252.

when conjunction, velocity or effort is absent. It exists, in earth and water

Fluidity (Dravatva) is the cause of flowing. It belongs to earth, water and light It is natural in water It is derived or caused in earth and light The fluidity belonging to snow, ice, hailstone, etc , is due to the contact of the earthly light (Tejas), as it is in the case of gold

Viscidity (Sneha) belongs to water, and is the cause of cohesion, smoothness, etc

Knowledge, pleasure, pain, desire, aversion and effort are the specific qualities of the soul Of these, except knowledge, the remaining five qualities are known through mental perception

The real problem, however is with regard to the nature of objects of our knowledge Do they exist in the external world, or are they merely images of our knowledge? The Buddhists accept the latter view and deny the external reality of the empirical world The Logicians hold that empirical objects are externally real, and that they are directly presented in determinate perception At the first moment we are conscious only of the object presented in the perception, and not of the perception itself It is only in the next moment that we get a mental perception of our perception, technically called Anuvyavasāya[1] Thus, according to the Logicians, knowledge is not self luminous

Kumārila accepts the full logical implications of the theory of the immediate and direct perception of objects If knowledge is self luminous, and we are not conscious of it at the first moment, what consolation can there be in formulating

1 Anuvyavasāya, apperception mental knowledge of perception in the form 'I know this jar' the form of the perception being 'this is a jar'.

a theory of its subsequent mental perception ? He declares that knowledge is not perceptible at all It is only presumable. He holds that the perception of an object produces a quality called manifestedness (Jñātatā) in the object, and that it is through this manifestedness produced in the external object that knowledge of the object is presumed

Pleasure (Sukha) is an agreeable feeling It is of three kinds— 1) worldly, 2) heavenly and 3) that of emancipation. The first is produced by garlands, sandal paste, women etc. and is mixed with misery. The second is to be attained in another region and is free from misery but has gradation The third one is liberation (Mukti)[1]

Pain (Duḥkha) is a feeling of injury to the self It is a feeling of self abasement. It is of two kinds— 1) worldly and other worldly (Naraka).

Desire (Icchā) is a craving for the attainment of an object

Aversion (Dveṣa) is the particular mood whose object is an enemy.

Effort (Prayatna) is that activity which leads to the attainment of desirable and to the abandoning of the undesirable.

Faculty (Saṁskāra) is of two kinds viz worldly and scriptural. Worldly faculty is of three different kinds, 1) velocity (Vega) which keeps a thing in motion (it exists in earth, water, light, air and darkness), 2) mental impressibility (Bhāvanā), by which the soul is able to remember and recognize things already experienced, and 3) elasticity (Sthitisthāpakatva) by virtue of which a thing reverts to its original state even when it is disturbed It is the quality of tangible substances Scriptural faculty is produced by shaping, purifying, sprinkling, beating etc. It can be understand from hearing a word in the accusitive case, live 'One purifies clarified butter' 'One sprinkles the rice' 'One beats the paddy' etc[2].

1 आज्यमुत्पुनाति, तण्डुलान्प्रोक्षति, व्रीहीनवहन्ति ।

2 Supra, p. 128

Audible sound (Dhvani) Śabara describes the manifestation of audible sound as follows— 'the airs, set in action by some impact, push their way through the silent air and produce conjunction and disjunction in all directions, and travel so long as they have velocity Sound is heard so long as they do not stop, and not, when they stop' The audible sound is a quality of air and is the manifester of sound While the letters (Varnas) themselves are eternal, the audible sounds manifesting them are not so They come into being and pass out They suffer modifications as long or short The difference between a short and a long vowel is then a characteristic of the audible sound, not of the letters Yet by superimposing these characters on the letters, we get valid differences of sense. For e g Naga and Nāga, though identical in the letter aspect, signify different things— a mountain and an elephant

Manifestation (Prākaṭyam)

Kumārila says that the perception of an object produces a quality called manifestation in the object, and that it is through this manifestation produced in the external object that knowledge of the object is presumed The manifestation should be accepted as a separate quality on the grounds of empirical usages in the forms the cloth appears, the cloth is presented, the cloth is manifested, etc It is what is determinative of the object and, existing in all substances, is a general quality And this is to be understood by perception through the contact of identity with what is in conjunction (Saṃyukta-tādātmya-sambandha) Though it abides in substances only, but it is found indirectly in genus, quality and action-owing to the relation of identity with them, and also in non-existence of which they are counter-positive entities They become objects of knowledge through the manifestation of substances

1 अभिघातेन हि प्रेरिता वायव स्तिमितानि वाय्वन्तराणि प्रतियोघमाना· सर्वतो बिक्कान् सयोगविभागानुत्पादयन्तो यावद्वेगमभिप्रतिष्ठन्ते। अनुपरतेष्वेव शब्द उपलभ्यते, नोपरतेषु– SBH शब्दाधिकरणम्।

Potency (Śakti) is a quality, which has the genus 'potentiality', is located in substance, quality or action It is known through presumption or scriptures. Causality is in every case determined by potency. Fire burns, because it has the potency to burn. The Logicians do not accept potency at all and include it under the nature (Svabhāva) Nature, however, permanent, where as fire is found sometimes not to burn, in the presence of spells or charms. One cannot say that these are hindrances of burning and their absence has to be reckoned as part of the cause, because, a mere negation like absence can effect nothing So potency should be accepted as a distinct quality [1] The Prābhākaras however, treat it as a distinct substance

PRĀBHĀKARA VIEW

Śālikanātha, following Kaṇāda, enumerates seventeen qualities as colour, taste, odour, touch, number, dimension, individuality, conjunction, disjunction, remoteness, proximity, knowledge, pleasure, pain, desire, aversion and effort [2] Praśastapāda, while commenting on the aphorism of Kaṇāda adds seven more qualities under the shelter of the conjunction Nārāyana, the commentator of PP, following Praśastapāda adds seven more qualities viz, merit, demerit, gravity, fluidity, viscidity, faculty and sound [3] But actually speaking, according to the Prābhākaras qualities are twentytwo only because they do not accept 'number' to be a quality rather a distinct category and puts 'merit' and 'demerit' to one quality i e. unseen-result (Adrsta)

Colour is the quality apprehended by the eye only. It is of seven varieties— white, blue, yellow, red, green, brown and variegated. The Bhāṭṭas say that variegated colour is not a distinct colour but the mixture of several colours. The

1 S V Saṁbandhākṣepa 29

2 रूपरसगन्ध .. प्रयत्नाश्च प्रत्यक्षग्राह्या । PP. p. 150

3 गुणान्तराण्यपि धर्माधर्मगुरुत्वस्नेहसंस्कारशब्दादीनि N. S. p. 151

Prābhākaras, like the Logicians, establish it as a distinct colour under the grounds that the invariable law of colour being a quality that resides in the entire object [1]

Taste is the quality apprehended by the gustatory organ. Odour is the quality perceived by the olfactory organ. Touch is the quality perceived by the tactile organ alone. It is of three kinds— cold, hot and neither hot nor cold Hardness, softness etc, are the varieties of conjunctions but not the varieties of touch It is acceptable to the Logicians also [2]

'Number' is the cause of the convention of counting Bhāsarvajña, the author of Nyāyabhūṣaṇa, says that oneness is only an aspect of objects' own form and not a separate objective quality [3] Following Bhāsarvajña's view, Nārāyana establishes that the numbers are two to Parārdha (a hundred thousand billions) [4]

Dimension is the cause of the convention of measurement. It is of four varieties: minute, medium, short and long It is transitory in transitory things, and is eternal in eternal things. Separateness (Pṛthaktva) is the cause of the notion of a thing being separate According to the Bhāṭṭa, it is the cause of conventional expression such as 'this is distinct from that.' It exists in eternal as well non-eternal substances[5] But the Prābhākaras establish separability that exists only in eternal substances, such as atoms not in the non-eternal substances, such as products [6]

1 N S p. 155

2 काठिन्यप्रशिथिलत्वादयस्तु संयोगविशेषा, न स्पर्शान्तरम् ।
उभयेन्द्रियग्राह्यत्वात् । Nyāyakandalī p 106

3 Sridhara points out that in that case, the use of two words together, viz, one and jar will be superfluous, because they will be cannoting the same object. Nyāyakandalī. p. 62

4 N S p 155 5 Supra p 146

6 पृथक्त्वन्तु गुणो नित्यद्रव्येषु परमाणुषु ।
भवेद्व्यावर्त्तको धर्मं कार्यद्रव्येषु नेष्यते ।। पदार्थदीपिका

The meeting of two things which are removed from each other, is called conjunction. It is of three kinds 1) Conjunction due to the movement of one of the substances conjoined e g the contact of the hand with a book, due to the activity o the hand in grasping a book, 2) Conjunction due to the movement of two substances conjoined, e g , the contact of two wrestlers fighting with each other , and 3) Conjunction due to another conjunction, e.g , the contact of a body with a tree due to the contact of a hand with a tree The Bhāttas do not accept the third kind of conjunction [1]

The separation of two things, which are conjoined is called disjunction The Bhāttas as well as the Prābhākaras accept it as of three kinds Remoteness and Proximity are the special causes of common usage of words expressing remoteness and Proximity Each of them is of two varieties spatial and temporal Spatial remoteness is fo und in things existing at a distance. Spatial proximity is found in things existing near Temporal remoteness found in an elderly person and temporal proximity sound in an younger person

Gravity is the non intimate cause of the downward motion in a falling substance It resides in earth and water.

Fluidity is the cause of the flow of a liquid substanct It is of two kinds : natural and artificial. The former is in water and the latter is in earth and light.

Viscidity is the agent that causes aggultination. It exists in water only [2]

Knowledge, pleasure, pain, desire, aversion and effort are the qualities of the self. These are perceived through the mind (manas).

Sound is a quality which is perceived by the ear. It is of two kinds viz. inarticulate and articulate. Inarticulate sound is that which is produced from drum, etc Sounds such as 'ka' that are produced by the conjunction of the throat, and

1 Supra p. 146

2 चिक्कणत्व स्नेह. स जले वर्तते NS, p. 160

so on are articulate All sound abides in ether The Logicians do not accept eternity of sound Śālikanātha criticises the Logicians' view and establishes that sound is eternal,[1] by referring to the recognition which we are conscious of in the case of the same letter and which takes a form like this—This sound 'ka' which heard several times before (Soyam kakārah) He says that the notions, 'The ka is originated, and 'the ka is destroyed' should be understood in the meaning of the audible sound (dhvani) manifesting the letter It is understood by all that the reason why the Mīmāṁsakas are particular to maintain the theory of eternity of letter is, the theory of the eternity of Veda rests upon the eternity of letters The only difference between the Bhāttas and the Prābhākaras is that the former accepts it as a distinct substance and the latter establishes it as a quality of the substance ' ether'.[2]

Knowledge is the manifestation of objects Experience is right knowledge and it is something different from memory. Memory is regarded as invalid knowledge in as much as it stands in need of a previous knowledge The Prābhākaras divide all knowledges into those of the nature of memory and those not of the nature of memory [3] They declare that there are always three factors present in every act of knowledge although they may not be distinctly noticeable In every knowledge, say, that of a jar, the three factors of knowledge are : 1) that of the object 2) that of knowledge itself which must be held to be self luminous and 3) that of the knower While the Bhāttas felt shy of accepting even two factors in a knowledge i e the knowledge of the object and that of its knowledge[4] and the Logicians felt shy of holding the simultaneous knowledge of the two (the object and its knowledge) by the same act of knowledge, the Prābhākaras boldly declare that there are three

1 अन्येत्वाहु – संयोगाद्विभागाद्वाऽऽद्यश्शब्दो ... PP p 356

2 Supra, p 142

3 अनुभूति प्रमाण सा स्मृतेरन्या स्मृति. पुन ।
पूर्वविज्ञानसंस्कारमात्रज ज्ञानमुच्यते ॥ PP p 127

4 Supra p 11

factors in a knowledge, which are received simultaneously by the same act of knowledge.

Pleasure is experienced by all with aggreeable feeling The individual experience of happiness arising from the awareness 'I am happy' is the characteristic of pleasure

Pain is experienced by all with disaggreeable feeling. Wish is desire Anger is ill - feeling Effort is the will to do Unseen result (Adrsta) is that which is born of enjoined actions It is of two kinds viz, merit and demerit which are respectively born of enjoined and prohibitted actions

Faculty is of two kinds, born of knowledge and born of action The former resides in the soul only. The latter resides in earth, water, light, air and mind. The Bhāṭṭas[1] and the Logicians accept elasticity (Stitisthāpaka) as third kind of faculty But the Prābhākaras include it in the faculty born of action and do not accept it as a distinct one [2]

MOTION

BHĀTTA VIEW

The third category is motion (Karma) The place of motion inside the categories is due to the fact that, like the quality, it necessarily presupposes a substance as bearer, while it itself can neither be the bearer of a movement nor of a quality. Nārāyana defines motion as that which resides only in non-pervasive substances, and is the cause of disjunction and conjunction [3] Motion resides in a substance like a quality, but it is its temporary feature, where as a quality is its permanent feature. Conjunction, which is a quality, resides in many

1 Supra p 149

2 स्थितिस्थापक केचित्कर्मजेऽन्तर्भूतमिति मन्यन्ते N S p. 160

3 अविभुद्रव्यमात्रस्थ त्यक्ष चलनात्मकम् ।
वियोगयोगयोर्मूल कर्म कर्मविदो विदु ॥ MM, p. 283

substances, which are conjoined with each other, but motion is present in one substance only. For instance, conjunction of a book with a table resides in two substances, while the motion of a fan resides in it only.

Motion is a cause of disjunction and conjunction. For example, the motion of a vehicle is the direct and immediate cause of its disjunction from one part of the ground and conjunction with another part of it. All motions must subsist in corporeal substances such as earth, water, light, air, darkness and the soul. There can be no movement of incorporeal substances i.e. ether, time, space, mind and sound, because these cannot change their positions. Unlike the Logicians, Kumārila recognises motion in the self also. Physical motion is not the only form of motion [1]

Taking the direction as the basis of classification the Bhāṭṭas, like the Logicians, distinguish the following kinds of motion upward motion (Utksepana), downward motion, (avaksepana), contraction (Ākuñcana), expansion (Prasāraṇa) and locomotion (Gamana).[2] 1) Upward motion is the cause of the contact of a body with some heigher region, e g, throwing a ball upwards. This is due to weight effort and conjunctions. Downward motion is the cause of the contact of a body with some lower region e g throwing down a ball from house-top. 3) Contraction is that kind of motion by which the upper parts of an extended substance are disjoined with those parts with which they were connected before and are

1 There is a person (soul), bearing the potentialities of Ideas, and being eternal, omnipresent and capable of migrating into another body. And as such, even though not actually moving it would become connected with another body. On account of its active character, the soul comes to be the performer of sacrifices. We do not hold 'Motion' to be the only form of action as held by the Logicians.

S V Atma 73-74

2 तत्पुनरुत्क्षेपणावक्षेपणाकुञ्चनप्रसारणगमनभेदात्पञ्चविधमेव ।

combined with the parts at the bottom, so that the substanct becomes curved e g, clinching of the fingers. 4) Expansion is that kind of motion by which the upper parts of a substance become disjoined with the parts of the same substance at the bottom and become connected with the upper parts with which they were disconnected before, so that the object becomes straight, e g, opening one's clinched hand 5) Locomotion · whatever type of motion not covered by the varieties mentioned above is referred to by the general term locomotion, which, therefore, implies motion in general Locomotion embraces different kinds of motion as rotatory motion, going up of flames, flowing down of liquids, falling down due to weight, etc.

The Prābhakaras hold that motion is not perceptible. When a substance is said to be in motion, only the conjunctions and disjunctions of that substance with space-points are perceived, from which the phenomenon of motion is inferred In other words the same object called Devadatta is perceived when he is known as stationary or when he is known as moveing. No other entity like motion which is different from the form of Devadatta is ever perceived This has been criticised both by the Bhāttas[1] and the Logicians [2]

Pārthasārathi says that motion is not something to be inferred, it is directly perecived. It cannot be regarded as inferred, because it could be inferred only as the non-constituent cause of the conjunctions and disjunctions of the active object with points in space And as such, it would have to be known as subsisting in that thing as well as in space Infact, it is known in the thing only Motion must be regarded as perceived, the thing, passing through certain conjunctions and disjunctions with points in space, actually perceived, but the knowledge that we have is that what brings about these conjunctions and disjunctions with points in space. And that which forms the basis of this knowledge is called the motion of them[3].

1 SD p 50, MM p. 285 3 S D. p. 50
2 NM, Part I p 121, NK p. 194

PRĀBHĀKARA VIEW

Motion is that which resides only in substance, is devoid of qualities, and is the direct and the immediate cause of conjunction and disjunction[1] Motion resides in a substance like a quality It is of five kinds, viz, upward motion, downward motion, contraction, expantion and locomotion. The Bhāṭṭas and the Logicians establish motion to be perceptible While the Prābhākaras criticising their views, establish motion as inferable Bhaṭṭaviṣṇu says that motion is super-sensuous, because it is an activity, like the sun's movement. The presence of the visual organ where that motion is present is exhausted with the perception of the probans[2] When a substance is said to be in motion, we do not perceive anything other than the conjunctions and disjunctions of that substance with space-points, from which alone we infer the phenomenon of motion The same object is perceived when it is known as stationary, or when it is known as moving. No other entity like motion which is different from the form of substance is ever perceived

Śabarasvāmin's Bhāṣya 'Just as, seeing the arrival of Devadatta at another place preceded by a motion, there is the recollection of motion in the sun too[3]' also supports the Prābhākara view i e. motion is inferable.

GENUS

BHATTA VIEW

All the substances differ from each other though they may have some similar characteristic features. This pot is differ-

1 द्रव्याश्रय्यगुणवान्सयोगविभागेष्वनपेक्षकारण कर्म । NS p. 215

2 परोक्ष कर्म कर्मत्वाबादित्यगतकर्मवत् ।
अक्षतद्भावभावित्व क्षीण लिङ्गस्य बर्शने ।। quoted in PP p 215

3 यथा देवदत्तस्य गतिपूर्विका देशान्तरप्राप्तिमवलोक्य आदित्येऽपि गति स्मरणम् । S Bh. p 32

ent from that pot which is in the adjoining room. Both are nevertheless made of clay resembling in shape and size Their material is similar, shape and sizes are also similar All the qualities that go to make a pot may be called 'potness' which is shared by both the pots and all pots everywhere else Such class of the same substance is known as genus (Sāmānya or Jāti)

The concept of genus is apprehended from the view point of meaning also All the words, except proper nouns, denote universal meanings. So the Mīmāmsakas establish that the word denotes only the genus, the particular being known through implication The Grammarians explain that the word denotes the particular The Logicians say that the word connotes the particular, but qualified by the genus. The Buddhists aver that the meaning of a word is anything but not real According to them, the genus is only name and not real. A cow is called a cow, not because it shares the genus 'cowness', but because it is different from all objects which are not cows A cow, therefore, means a not non-cow. There is no genus which is real; it is only a name with a negative connotation Technically it is called Apoha.

Kumārila refutes the Buddhist theory. No doubt Apoha excludes non-cow. but non-cow can be excluded only if cow itself is established, because non-cow is the negation of cow. The Buddhist, therefore, must explain the nature of a cow which is negatived by the particle 'Nai' (non). And if cow is of the nature of negation (exclusion) of non cow, it implicates the fallacy of mutual dependance. If, however, the cow it self established, the postulation of the theory of Apoha is useless. The conclusion, therefore, is that without cow being established, a non-cow cannot be postulated, and without the latter, the 'cow' cannot be conceived[1].

The Jains maintain that the genus is nothing but similarity (Sadṛśa Pariṇāma). Kumārila critisises the Jaina view; similarity means identity in some respects and difference in

1 S. V Apoha 13th Adhikaraṇa

others and it presupposes the genus. It involves no identity and it cannot be the basis of identical concepts. If there is no genus but only similarities, the perception of two cows may suggest that they are similar and not that they are cows in the sence that both belong to the same genus of cows The knowledge of them is of the nature that 'this is the same as that' and not 'this is similar to that'[1] This proves that the above knowledge is based on identity and not on similarity. So, the genus is distinct from the similarity

Kumārila establishes genus as a distinct category The general idea of cows, horses, etc., must have causes other than the particular cows and horses, because they have a distinct characters of their own. This can be explained in that the quality is different from the substance even though the substance and quality are found together. The cowness must be something distinct from the particular cow, because it forms the object of another knowledge, like the knowledge of colour and touch. The cowness must be distinct from the particular cow, because it is designated by a distinct name cowness' like Citra and horse. The idea of the particular cow and the cowness must be different, because they have distinctive marks of their own, like the idea of colour, etc So, the genus is distinct from the particular[2]. If the existence of genus is not established, there will be neither inference nor verbal testimony, as the individuals being innumerable, no common relationship can be established on their basis[3].

Kumārila says that the class-concept must be distinguished from the group concept, as in the example of forest. The term 'forest' is only a collective name signifying a collection of individual trees[4] But the term 'treeness' does not

1 Ibid. Akrti V. 66–69

2 Ibid. Vanavāda 44–48

3 अनिष्यमाणे सामान्ये वृत्तिः शब्दानुमानयोः ।
न हि स्यान्न हि सम्बन्धो भेदैरानन्त्यतो भवेत् ॥ Ibid 39

4 Ibid, Vanavāda 54–55

signify the collection of trees. This contrast is elearly established by the usage of the term 'treeness' for each individual tree, while the term 'forest' is not used for each individual tree There is also another difference. From the epistemological point of view the knowledge of the treeness is different from that of the individual tree But the knowledge of forest is not different from the knowledge of trees[1]

Kumārila says that the genus is Akṛti, by which individual thing or person is specified It is the common nature determing the identical knowledge of different individuals[2] or things. The genus, like cowness, is eternal omnipresent and perceptible through the genus present everywhere, it is manifested only in and through the individual objects comprising a class Every object has two aspects, the general and the individual When we have the notion of commonness, we know the genus but when we have the notion of difference, we know the individual substances. The general and the individual are mutually dependents A class devoid of individuals does not exist, in the same manner, in the absense of generality there could be nothing individual[3] If individuals are devoid of common character, no general idea could arise. All concepts do not lead to the genus some of them lead to extraneous adjunt (Upādhi) also A genus cannot subsist in another genus, otherwise it leads to the flaw of ad-infinitum (Anavasthā) What subsists in one individual only is also not a genus like etherness subsisting in ether The concept of non-existence may relate to many things, but it is not genus, because it is not related through identity[4].

Kumārila explains the process of genus as follows.

1 Ibid 71–73 3 Ibid. 9-10

2 जातिरेवाकृतिं प्राह व्यक्तिराक्रियतेऽनया ।
सामान्य तच्च पिण्डानामेकबुद्धिनिबन्धनम् ॥ Ibid. Akṛti 3

4 व्यक्तेरभेदस्तुल्यत्व सङ्करोऽथानवस्थिति ।
रूपहानिरसबन्धो जातिबाधकसग्राहः ॥
For details see, Kiranāvali of Udayana p 13

Every individual person or thing have some peculiar features. which assimilate them with one class and differentiate them from others For example, the possession of the features like dew lap, horns etc , distinguish the cow from all other class of animals. These specific features cannot be regarded either as the manifesters of the genus or as it's attributes, because without the knowledge of these features also the genus can be known. It avoids the flaw of ad-infinitum* These specific features are regarded only as indicators to specify the genus.

The knowledge of the genus arises directly, just as the knowledge of the individual thing or its properties It is independent of the specifying features in the sense that it does not depend on the recognition of the specific features. But it is also dependent on them in the sense that the cognition of the genus is possible only when these specific features are present in that thing The knowledge of the specifying features invariably follows the knowledge of the genus, because these two are inseparable The specifying features may also be regarded as properties of the genus, since there is no absolute difference between the specifying features and the individual person or thing possessing them, and between the individuals and the genus[2]

There is natural internal relationship between the genus and the individual thing or person It is not based on anything external to them[3] This relationship is inherent in them and it is known as Tādātmya (identity). For example, cowness subsists only in animals which possess features like dew-lap etc , since the cow ness is identified in them This identity is due to the very nature of the genus and its particulars manifesting it[4] The difference of the genus from its particulars is also a natural one as it is perceptible[5] For instance in the sentence 'this is a cow', the word 'this' expresses the particular and the word 'cow' indicates the genus 'cowness'. If the genus

1 Ibid 2-5 2 Ibid 9-10

3 स्वाभाविकश्च सम्बन्धो जातिव्यक्त्योर्न हेतुमान् । SV, Akrti 31

4 Ibid 4-7 5 Ibid 48-50

and its particulars are absolutely different the expression must be found 'this and cowness', as in the case of 'a jar and a cloth' which are absolutely different If there is identity between the genus and its particulars like in Hasta and Kara, 'this' and 'cow' would turn out to be synonymous Therefore, since the words 'this' and 'cowness' are not synonymous, but are two different entities perceptible as one and the same.

Kumārila however does not recognise a radical difference between the genus and its particulars. Nor does he accept inherent relationship between a genus and its particulars The two are different as well as identical The relationship is that of identity of the two which are both different and identical. The apparent contradiction though is not real, is not subjected to questioning. He further opines that the genus is unified in itself, but it is also diverse in its individual instances The unity of genus cannot be questioned on the ground of the apparent contradiction between the two, because one and the same genus is perceived in different individuals Just as an individual is recognised as the same at different times and places, the genus is also recognised to be the same, though it subsists in different substrates.[1]

The Logicians say that the relationship between the genus and its particulars is inherent [Samavāya-sambandha]. The genus is therefore defined as 'that which resides in its particulars by inherent relation and which at the same time is eternal'[2] The two related entities appear as if fused together, like fire and iron in a hot piece of iron The genus and its particulars of course, are not identical. They are two different entities Yet the form of the genus is not cognized as distinct from the individual thing or person. But the difference can be comprehended between one and the other. For example, although we have no knowledge of the genus 'cow ness', we still know the particular cow as separate.

1 यथा च व्यक्तिरेकैव दृश्यमाना पुनः पुनः ।
कालभेदेऽप्यभिन्नैव जातिर्भिन्नाश्रया सती ॥ S. V Vanavāda 32

2 नित्यत्वे सत्यनेकसमवेतत्वम् । NSM on K V. 8

Although an individual cow which was seen before may not be there, yet we know the genus 'cow-ness' in another cow. Therefore, the genus is absolutely different from the individual person or thing.

Pārthasārathi critisises the Logicians' view and argues that if the genus and its particulars are regarded as absolutely different, our judgement cannot be 'this is a cow', but 'this has cow ness' Our judgement of cow is of the form 'this is a cow' and not of the form 'this has cow ness' proves that the genus and its particulars are not absolutely different[1]. Again if the genus and its particulars are absolutely identical, the subject and predicate terms of the judgement 'this is a cow' would become synonymous. Both these equations being evidently intercontradictory, the genus and its particulars must be regarded as both different as well as identical. About the idea of inherence as an external relation to its relata, Pārthasārathi points out that if inherence is identical to its relata, there will be no relation at all. If it is different, there is the flaw of ad-infinitum. Thus the Logicians' idea of inherence leads to the absence of relationship between the genus and its particulars

The Logicians accept existence (Sattā) in substance, quality and action[2] Kumārila says that since the concept of existent is found in respect of substances, like earth and water, in genera, like horse-ness, cow-ness, in qualities, like colour and taste, in action, like going and coming, the summum genus called 'existence' has to be accepted as present in the four categories, viz., substance, genus, quality and action. In this connection the Logicians object that if one genus is accepted as existing in another genus, it would lead to the flaw of ad-infinitum. To this Pārthasārathi replies that only

1 इय गौरिति बुद्धिद्वयमपर्यायेण प्रतिभासमानमेक वस्तुद्वयात्मकं व्यवस्थापयति… SDP p 393

2 सामान्य द्विविध प्रोक्त पर चापरमेव च ।
द्रव्यादित्रिकवृत्तिस्तु सत्तापरापरतयोच्यते ।। K V 8

the acceptance of one cow-ness in another cow ness or one horse-ness in another horse-ness, it would lead to the flaw of ad infinitum So, the acceptance of existence in genus does not lead to the flaw ad-infinitum As such the existence exists the aforementioned four categories.

As one hears a new sound, he gets the knowledge of it and uniformity, by hearing another sound, he cognises that it is another sound similar to the former. On the basis of such experience, the sound-ness is established as the genus of sound Similarly, the genus of brahmin 'Brahmin-hood' is established It is known by perception The Brahmin-hood is directly perceived by the tradition that one's parents and ancestors are of the same class

PRĀBHĀKARA VIEW

The view of the Prābhākaras on the genus is similar to that of the Logicians Prabhākara maintains, like the Logicians that the genus is different from its particulars in which it subsists by inherent relation. He also holds that the genus is directly perceived due to the repetition of the same form in our experience [1] Genus can be recognised only in perceptible substances And any common attributes, which cannot be perceived alike illiterate words of individuals, should not be regarded as genera

The relationship between the genus and its particulars is only inherent one, the relationship of identity [Tādātmya] being discarded as an impossible jumble. The inherent relationship is neither one nor eternal. It is born anew in the case of every entity related by inherence. In this connection, it may be noted that, the Bhāṭṭas view the relation ship between the genus and its particulars is that of identity [Tādātmya], the Prābhākaras opine it as inherence; the Vaiśeṣikas feel it as inherence which is one and eternal

1 जातिराश्रयतो भिन्ना प्रत्यक्षज्ञानगोचरा।
पूर्वंकर्मविमर्शीण प्रभाकरगुरोर्मता ॥ PP p. 64

but not perceptible, and the Naiyāyikas regard it as inherence. which is one and eternal and also perceptible

Śālikanātha divides inherence into two kinds : eternal and transient. The inherence between two eternal things is eternal, but in two transient things or between an eternal and a transient thing the inherence is found to be transient. Because in these causes inherence is a form of the causal factorsl of either of the relata.[1]

Śalikanātha maintains that it is absurd to regard inherent relation as existent even after one of the relata is destroyed No relation having a transient relation can legitimately be regarded as eternal If the relation between the genus and its porticulars is eternal, the former should be perceived even after the latter is destroyed The fact that it is not so perceived, proves that the relationship between the two is not eternal. The destruction of the particular is the cause of the non-perception of the genus, while the Logicians differ to say that the destruction of the particular alone is the cause of the said non-perception[2]

The Logicians feel that inherence is the cause of the notion of 'constitive locus' [Iha Pratyaya] and 'hev use such expression as 'cow-ness is in the cow' [Iha Gavi Gotvam] inorder to express the knowledge of the genus But the Prābhākaras do not admit the above expressions as legitimate, since both the genus and its particulars are the contents of one and the same knowledge Śālikanātha points out that the relationship between the genus and its particulars, viz, inherence, must be distinguished from the relationship of containing [Iha] The latter is apprehended there where two things are first known separately and then one is found to be 'contained' in the order But such is not the case as regards the knowledge of genus.

The knowledge of genus is never known without that of the particulars. It is always known as inherent in the particulars, which is impossible without the knowledge of the latter.

1 N S on PP p. 92 2 PP p 93

Thus the genus and its particulars being known by one and the same sense-organ and being the contents of one and the same knowledge, it must be admitted, Śālikanātha argues that there are no separate knowledges of the two. Consequently there can be knowledge of the genus as 'contained' in the particulars [1] The relationship between the substance and its particulars, the Prābhākaras aver, must be distinguished from that of the support and the supported The particular is related to the genus as substance is to its attribute It is therefore, wrong to regard it as the support of the genus [2]

The Bhāṭṭas establish existence [Sattā] as summum genus, since it resides in four categories, viz., substance, genus, quality and action The Logicians admit existence in three categories only viz , substance, quality and action. The Prābhākaras, however deny the existence altogether. Śālikanātha argues that the genus must be admitted wherever there is the knowledge of the same[3] But no identity is apprehended in the experience of things belonging to different classes Normally any identity, for instance, between a mountain and an ant-hill or between a smell and a taste cannot be apprehended Hence there is no ground for admitting 'existence' (Sattā) as a genus So far as the usage of word 'existence' is concerned, it does not necessarily imply a corresponding genus, just as the usage of the word 'cook' does not imply the genus 'cook-ness'.

The objective characteristic extraneous adjunct (Upādhi), determining the use of the word 'existence' is, according to Śālikanātha 'knowability by a valid means of knowledge' (Pramāṇa sambandha yogyatā) [4] This 'knowability' is nothing but the self being (Svarūpa sattā) of things. Only those things are existent, which have self being or are objects of valid assertions of things They, either of past or future,

1 न च तत्र इह प्रत्ययापत्तिर्दोष , प्रतीत्याह्याधारमाधेयञ्च सम्बन्ध प्रतीयते । PP p. 94 2 NS p. 94

3 पूर्वानुकारिणि यदि धीरुबीयते, ततोऽभ्युपेयतैव जाति. । PP. p. 97

4 Ibid p. 97

would be true only with reference to the genus 'existence', which, by hypothesis, is eternal. Our doubts pertain to the self being of things, once it is ascertained that there is no fresh doubt about their existence Even the Logicians view that the term 'existence' is applicable to the categories of genus, particularity and inherence It means that the characteristic of self-being (svarūpa-satta) is not the genus 'existence' Similarly they deny the genus of sound i e. sound ness The Prābhākaras say that the caste of an individual can not be accepted as genus, simply on the basis of one's parents and, ancestors So, the Brahminness, etc , are only extraneous adjuncts (Upādhis) and not genera [1]

REPUDIATION OF PARTICULARITY

BHĀṬṬA VIEW

Everything is differentiated from another on account of different attributes, different qualities and different genera. But in the case of two objects which have not only the same genus but being quite similar, have the same qualities, the question arises as to how one of them can be differentiated from the other The answer is that they are differentiated on account of the difference of their parts But how to distinguish one atom from another ? All the atoms of earth are alike and share the general characteristic features of earthness. How do then we distinguish one atom from another atom ?

The Viśeṣikas answer that particularity (Viśesa) ensures the separate existence of the atoms and empirical objects Praśastapāda holds that particularity is an independent reality residing in eternal substances distinguishing them from one another. As the ultimate atoms are innumerable, so are the particularities.

1 Ibid p 97

The Naiyayikas, the Bhāttas, the Prābhākaras, the Vedantins have criticised the Vaiśesika view on the grounds that if the particularity is necessary to distinguish individual atoms, then another particularity is necessary to distinguish that particularity as it leads to the defect of ad-infinitum. If one says that particularity has a unique essence which serves to differentiate them, then the unique essence can be accepted to exist in the atoms and there is no need to introduce an unnecessary concept of particularity If one has to bring in the inherent faculty some where, why not suppose it in the individual atom itself and discard the superfluous particularity altogether rather than attribute a particularity to the atom first and then later attribute the inheren faculty of self distinction to the particularity

Praśastapāda while anticipating this type of argument answers thus: knowledge caused through the agency of a thing relates to things other than itself For instance, a lamp causes the knowledge of a jar, etc, but the knowledge of a lamp is never brought about by another lamp. Just as the flesh of a dog is unclean by itself and its contact defiles other things also, similarly, in the case of particularities, differentiation being their nature, they are differentiated by them selves, and by their contact atoms are also differentiated. But this explanation is hardly satisfactory. Then, only the Bhāttas and the Prābhākaras, who accept all the Vaiśesika categories only with slight alterations, refuse to admit the category of particularity as residing in atoms and other eternal substances.

1 अथान्त्यविशेषेष्विव परमाणुषु कस्मान्न स्वतः प्रत्ययव्यावृत्तिः प्रत्यभिज्ञान वा कल्प्यत इति चेन्न तादात्म्यात। इह तादात्म्य निमित्तप्रत्ययो भवति यथा घटादिषु प्रदीपात् । न तु प्रदीपे प्रदीपात्। यथा च श्वमासादीना स्वत एवाशुचित्व तद्योगादन्येषा तथेहापि तादात्म्यादन्त्यविशेषेषु स्वत एव प्रत्ययव्यावृत्तिस्तद्योगात् परमाण्वादिषु ... P Bh. p. 323

INHERENCE

BHĀṬṬA VIEW

Inherence (Samavāya) is of the nature of a permanent relation intervening between two entities, one of which is incapable of separate existence apart from the other. It is defined in many ways by the Logicians According to Kaṇāda, it is the relation between cause and effect.[1] Praśastapāda regards it as a relation of the container and the contained. A few examples can clarify the exact nature of inherence. The chair which is on the ground, is not in inherent relation to the ground, because the chair is not inseparable. This inseparability is not identity since the two things are not one in reality The fire which inhers in the red hot ball of iron is separate from the ball itself The relationship of a substance to its qualities, a whole to its parts, a genus to its individuals, and an effect to its causes is that of inherent relationship.

Inherence is not conjunction (Saṃyoga), since the object conjoined has a seperate existence prior to conjunction, while the members related by inherence are inseparably connected. Conjunction ends at the moment when the member parts are separated, while in inherence there is no disjunction and consequently no termination of inherence

Conjunction takes place between two independnt substances while in inherence the members stand in the relation of the container and the contained Two things related to each other by inherence cannot be separated without at least one of them being destroyed Conjunction takes place between two things of similar nature which remain separate in the beginning and lateron conjoin, whereas the fire that inhers in the ball of iron is of a totally different nature Conjunction is of external relation while inherence is of internal relation In conjunction the member parts are joined together without forming a real whole, whereas in inherence the parts form a coherent whole

1 इहेदमिति यत कार्यकारणयो स समवाय: । VS VII 2-26

Kumārila criticises the above mentioned view of the Logicians. He holds that no relation can subsist between any two objects that are not already known to be established entities And if either member of the relation be accepted as being an established entity, prior to the assertion of the relation, then the inseparability ceases. Only those objects which exist separately, like a book and a hand can be related to one another Inseparable things, however being one and identical, which of them can be related to which ? So inseparableness and relationship cannot be reconciled[1] There being no inseparability, there is no any such relationship as inherence between the genus and the individual. And there being no ground for relationship there could be no relationship among the categories[2]

The Bhāttas ask a question : is Inherence itself related to the objects among, whom it is said to subsist, or not ? If it is not, then there can be no inherence with regard to the objects. And if it is, then this inherent relationship with the objects would stand in need of another relationship and so on and it leads to the defect of ad-infinitum[3] To get rid of the defect, the Logicians may declare that inherence is a sort of absolute relationship which does not require any other relation for its own subsistence in the objects But it cannot be acceptable to the Logicians because on account of this identity, the inherence may become only a particular form of the qualification and the qualified (i. e. genus and individual), which is not acceptable to the Logicians So the relationship, between the qualification and the qualified, is not that of inherence but is only that of identity-cum-difference [Tādātmya][4]. Here the

1 न चाप्ययुतसिद्धाना सम्बन्धित्वेन कल्पना ।
नानिष्पन्नस्य सम्बन्धो निष्पन्नो युतसिद्धता ॥

2 तथा च सति सम्बन्धे हेतु कश्चिन्न विद्यते ।
षण्णामपि न सम्बन्ध पदार्थाना प्रतीयते ॥ Ibid. 147

3 समवायनियोगाच्च विश्लेष. स्यात्परस्परम् ।
तत्वलुप्त्याव्यवस्था स्यात्तस्य तस्यानुषङ्गत: ॥ Ibid 148

4 अथ तस्यात्मरूपत्वान्नान्यसम्बन्धकल्पना ।
अभेदात्समवायस्तु स्वरूप धर्मधर्मिणो: ॥ Ibid p 49

relation of identity cum-difference is substituted for inherneces The reason is that inherence as a form of relation, subsisting between two naturally inseparable things, is rejected by the Bhāttas

Here arises a question as to why the Bhāttas rejecting the inherent relation of the Logicians, postulate a relation called identity-cum difference ? The reason for such postulation, as described by B K Dalal,[1] appears to be as following, Bhāttas wish to retain its fundamental claim as realists and at the same time, they intend to avoid the difficulties like its defect of ad-infinitum in the Logicians idea of inherence. They, therefore, deny absolute difference between the sets of objects and assert a natural relation They are afraid indeed to accept the absolute difference of objects, for, that would lead them to an undesirable state of unrelated world of the Buddhists. On the other hand, they did not want to entertain absolute identity either, lest, it would land them in an unplesant maze of identity to the pleasure of Vedāntins

PRĀBHĀKARA VIEW

Prabhākara, like the Logicians, admits inherence (Samavāya) as a distinct category It is the relationship between two inseparable entities The Logicians accept the category in question as eternal on the gourd that if it is accepted as non-eternal, it would necessarily be multiple and as it would be an effect of positive nature, all the three causes will have to be assigned to it and further there would arise many difficulties in the assumption of three causes. So, the Logicians say that inherence is eternal, being eternal, it can only be one Prabhākara criticising the eternality of inherence establishes that inherence of two kinds, viz., eternal and non-eternal The eternal is in eternal substances and the non-eternal in non-eternal substances There are many inherences Inherence is produced, when an effect is produced, which inhers in its

1 'Bhāttas Refutation of Inherence, A critique' p. 25

material cause.[1]

The Naiyāyikas hold that inherence is perceptible, while the Prābhākaras and the Vaiśesikas oppose the above view Generally an object can be perceived only if it comes in contact with a sense organ. Sense organs being substances can have contact in the form of conjunction [Samyoga] only with other substances In the case of the perception of non-substances indirect contacts are established.[2] In perceiving non-existence, the contact between the non-existence and the sense-organ is the contact of the qualifier and the qualified (Viśesanaviśesyabhāva). Inherence is also an attribute of the object in which something resides by that relation, and that inherence also, like non-existence, is perceived by the contact of the qualifier and the qualified.[3] The Prābhākaras denied the contact of the qualifier and the qualified Further as the other contacts unintelligible and are not admitted the inherence cannot be perceived However, inherence can be established through inference. The knowledge that there is cowness in this cow is conditioned by the relation of the container and the contained, because of the knowledge of cowness 'in this' [Iha] like the knowledge of rice in this jar[4] So inherence is inferable only.

POTENCY

BHĀṬṬA VIEW

The Prābhākaras establish potency (Śakti) as a distinct category It is imperceptible energy which produces an affect For ex: fire has the potency of burning Counter-agents counteract the operation of causes and causes turn-out tobe unavailing For instance, fire in the immediate vicinity of a particular-

1 PP p 17, TNR. p. 21
2 Supra, p. 23
3 समवाये चाभावे च विशेषणविशेष्यभाव NV p 97
4 PP. p. 17; TNR. p. 21 SV. Pratyaksa, 146

kind of gem and the like does not burn, but it does burn when it is free from that Here it is inferred that the gem, etc. destroy that power of fire which helps combustion, where as the presence of a stimulating gem or the removal of the previous gem generates it.

The counter action that we experience in such case cannot be explained otherwise than as consisting in the destruction of potency of the causes It is eternal in eternal substances and non-eternal in non-eternal substances It is generated along with the transient substances in which it subsists.[1]

The Bhāttas do not accept potency as a distinct category, but do accept as an unperceived quality in a substance, which is inferred from its effect It is generated along with the substance[2] The Logicians do not accept potency as neither category nor quality, but accept it as nature of the thing (Vastu svabhāva).

SIMILARITY

PRĀBHĀKARA VIEW

The Prābhākaras establish similarity (Sādṛśya) as a distinct category on the grounds that it cannot be identified with any of the five positive categories, being present even in a genus. Since no other category abides in a genus but similarity does, it is clearly distinct form all the five categories, viz , substance, quality, motion, genus, and inherence observe this similarity. When we say, ' as cowhood is eternal, so is horse-hood ' It cannot be identified with non-existence, for it is perceived as existence.[3]

1 PP. p p 81–82 : TNR p. 23

2 प्राभाकराः पुनरस्याः पदर्थान्तरत्व सगिरन्ते । तदयुक्तम् , अस्या. सिद्धस्यैव पदार्थस्य गुणत्वेन MM p. 266

3 Bṛhati p. 8

The Bhāṭṭas say that similarity cannot be a distinct category by itself, if it were so, we could not account for the varying degrees of similarity between things and things[1] Nor is there any reason for regarding it as a category · in fact, it consists only in the presence in one thing of the character and conditions present in another thing.[2]

NUMBER

Number (Saṅkhyā) is the cause of common usage of enumerative expression like one, two, etc. It is not a substance, since it subsists in qualities as 'there are two smells, three touches' and the like The subsistance of number in qualities cannot be said to be figurative, since its subsistance in them in a primary sense is not contradicted It is not a quality, since it abides in many categories, like a genus Nor is it a movement, since it is perceptible, unlike a movement. Nor is it a genus, since it is non eternal. Hence number is a distinct category. The Prakarana Pañcika, however, describes number as a quality.[3] The Bhāṭṭas and the Logicians accept number as a quality only.

NON - EXISTENCE

BHĀṬṬA VIEW

The empirical world presupposes relations. Every thing that exists today will change into something else and this something else is not entirely different from the previous object The cause or ground that changes is related to the

1 अपि च सादृश्यस्य तत्वान्तरत्वे गवयेन गौर्बहुसदृशः, वराहेण पुनरल्पसदृश इत्यादि ··· MM. p. 292
2 SD. p. 52
3 PP. p. 54 , Prabhākara mimāṁsā p. 89

subsequent effect in a certain relation A relation carries us from one thing to another and this transition is not a mere negation Thus every relation is a kind of negation A thing and its relations are closely connected When we speak of a relation, the fact of its non-being or negation is emphasised. A thing is position without contradiction, a relation is negation without contradiction

Though non-existence (Abhāva) is more a logical category than an ontological one, there is a tendency to regard non being as some thing existent on par with a being

Existence and non-existence are two sides of reality. Every thing can posses existence as well as non existence For this reason non-existence has been established as a category by the Bhāṭṭas and the Logicians.

So far as the idealists i e Bhudchists and Vedāntins are concerned the question of the reality of non-existence does not arise Among the realists, the Prābhākaras and the Sāmkhyās deny the objective reality of non-existence The Logicians say that not only does non-existence possess an objective reality, but it also is directly perceptible by the sense-organs, like other external objects The Bhāṭṭas declare that non-existence cannot be perceived being of a nagative nature, but only comprehended by a separate means of knowledge called non-apprehension (Anupalabdhi) [1]

The Naiyāyikas say that when a vacant floor is perceived through sense-contact, there also occurs the knowledge of non-existence in the form ‘the floor is without a pot’. So non-existence (of a pot) is held to be a perception like that of the floor itself. The Bhāṭṭa criticises the view on the grounds that although the non-existence of a pot and the floor seen to be simultaneously known by the senses, the former cannot be a sense-object, because firstly, it does not have colour (rūpa) which is a necessary condition of visual per-

1 Supra p. 87

ption and secondly, it does not have contact with the senses [1]

Pārthasārathi explains: every object can be viewed in two ways according to its existence and non-existence[2] So categories are divided into existence and non-existence The latter is of four divisions viz., 1) Prior non-existence, (Prāgabhāva), 2) Posterior non existence (Pradhvamsābhāva) 3) Mutual non-existence (Anyonyābhava), and 4) Absolute non-existence (Atyantābhāva).

Prior non-existence is the non-existence of a thing before its production– e g., the expression 'the cloth will come into existence', when the cloth is about to be produced A cloth is produced from threads. There is prior non-existence of the cloth in threads. The prior non-existence is without a beginning, but has an end It is destroyeed by the production of the effect. When the cloth is produced, its prior non-existence is destroyed Thus prior non-existence is not produced but destroyed It is without beginning but non eternal If it is not destroyed, the effect cannot be produced.

Destructive non existence is the non-existence of an effect by its destruction The expression 'this jar is destroyed' is an example of destructive non-existence. Destructive non-existence has a beginning, but does not have an end It is produced by the destruction of an effect, but it can never be destroyed. When a jar is destroyed by the stroke of a stick, it has destructive non existence in its fragments, which is produced by an efficient cause. Thus, the existence of a thing is confined to the intermediary period of Prior non-existence and destructive non-existence.

Mutual non-existence is mutual dissimilarity, e.g. the expression "a jar is not a cloth". The existence of a jar in a cloth, or of a cloth in a jar, is denied, as there is the total

1 ननु नीरुपस्यासम्बन्धस्य च चाक्षुषत्वमभावस्य कथमभिधीयते।
NM p.48

2 सर्वं हि वस्तु सदसदात्मना द्विविधम। SD p. 83

absence of any semblance between jar and cloth. It is one and eternal, but it is related to different objects when they are produced.

Absolute non-existence is a non-existence of a thing at all times — past, present and future. It does not refer only to the past or the future It is neither Prior non-existence nor destructive non existence It does not exist at all times. It is neither produced nor destroyed but eternal by nature. There is absolute non-existence of colour in air.

Mutual non-existence is mutual dissimilarity, e. g. the expression 'a jar is not a cloth'. The existence of a jar in a cloth, or of a cloth in a jar, is denied as there is the total absence of any semblance between jar and cloth. Mutual non-existence and absolute non-existence are quite different, the mutual is denial of identity between two things, which have specific natures, and the absolute is denial of an absolutely non existent entity in all times and in all places.[1]

PRĀBHĀKARA VIEW

The Prābhākaras contend that the basis of nagative proposition is the mere locus [kevalādhikaraṇa]. For instance, in the proposition ' There is no jar here on this floor ', the only thing which in fact, is referred to is the mere floor. If non-existence should thus be equated with the empty locus, it might easily be argued from the opposite camp that this is an evasive trick of the Prābhākara which could be easily seen through and that the concept of the ' mereness of the locus ' inevitably presupposes non-existence, The Prābhākara, however, meets this difficulty by explaining that the phrase, 'mere locus ' isonly a description of the form of the knowledge under

1 क्षीरे दध्यादि यन्नास्ति प्रागभावस्स उच्यते ।
नास्तिता पयसो दध्नि प्रध्वसाभावलक्षणम् ॥
गवि योऽश्वाद्यभवास्तु सोऽन्योन्याभाव उच्यते ।
शिरसोऽवयवानिम्ना वृद्धिकाठिन्यवर्जिताः ।
शशशृङ्गादिरूपेण सोऽत्यन्ताभाव उच्यते ॥ SV. Arūpa 4

lying negative statement and that non-existence, strictly speaking, is the knowledge of the locus, and of nothing else, in such circumstances as would necessarily lead to the counter-positive (pratiyogin) being cognised, were it present. Hence, Śālikanātha describes non-existence as 'Non existence is the cognition of that (locus) alone, when the counter-positive (the thing denied in a negative statement) ought to have been percieved where it is present'[1].

According to the Prābhākaras, knowledge of things is of two kinds : one takes place when a thing is viewed as accompanied by some other thing the other when a thing is viewed as existing alone The latter knowledge is again of two kinds : one takes place when we have in mind a counter - positive of perceptible nature, the other when we have in mind a counter-positive of imperceptible nature It is our knowledge of a thing as existing alone along with our having in mind a counter-positive of perceptible nature, that is called 'non–existence (of knowledge) of this counter-positive'[2]. Hence non-existence is not merely a knowledge of something as existing alone , for that would not enable us to distinguish between one non–existence and another It is only when we have a counter–positive of perceptible nature in mind that we know a non-existence. Thus when some thing is known and a particular counter-positive of perceptible nature is had in mind the knowledge of this thing is called 'non–existence' (of knowledge) of this counter–positive. 'So when a man says' 'there is no jar here on this floor' what he means is that he is seeing the mere floor while it was possible for him to have seen a jar as well

When one knows a mere locus i e. something that the Bhāṭṭa calls, a locus containing some non-existence of one of

1 वृश्ये प्रतियोगिनि या तदेकविषया बुद्धि सा तदभावो व्यपदिश्यते
PP, p 291

2 भावनामवगतिर्द्विविधा–एका तावद्भावान्तरससृष्टविषया, अपरा तदेकविषया । यापि च तदेकविषया बुद्धि , सापि द्विविधा…
ibid. p. 287

the four types' and has in mind a counter-positive of perceptible nature there ensues, according to the Prābhākaras, a non-existence (a knowledge) of this counter-positive. The phrase 'is not' is indicative of a locus of this description : that is why it is said that the Prābhākara regards the word 'not' as connotative of the nature of the concerned locus [1]

Free movement on a thornless floor is also due to the knowledge of this floor as existing alone. And it is quite understandable why here there should be a desire to ascertain that the concerned counter positive, viz. thorns, is of perceptible nature.[2] Similarly, the cancellation of a perception and the cancellation of an inference are due either to the knowledge of something as existing alone or due to the cancellaion of some usage. Thus what is cancelled is the usage of silver in relation to nacre or the usage of probans in relation to a fallacy. That is to say, in the view of Prābhākara, what is cancelled is never a knowledge but always a usage.[3]

The Prābhākaras also accept that the destruction of a previously existing thing is responsible to know a thing first as accompanied by some other thing (jar) and then as existing all alone But that the coming about of a destruction is always the emergence of a positive entity (and not the coming into existence of an independent entity called non-existence by destruction) The only entities that exist are positive ones, but a positive entity may either exist as accompanied by some other entity or it may exist all alone Thus the word 'destruction' stands for the emergence in to being of a positive entity as existing all alone. Even the Bhāṭṭas cannot escape this posi-

1 नास्ति शब्दश्च तादृशाधिकरणमात्रवाचक । नञ् शब्दश्च स्वरूपमात्रपर इति प्राभाकराः । TR, p. 18

2 अपि च कण्टकाविविरहिणि भूतलादौ यो निश्शङ्क: पादविन्यासादिव्यवहारः प्रवर्तते, स तावद् भूतलमात्रपरिच्छेदनिबन्धनो ··· ibid, p. 285

3 शुक्तिकाया रजतव्यवहारो लिंगाभासे लिंगव्यवहारश्च बाध्यते । न हि ज्ञान बाध्यते किन्तु व्यवहार एव, TR, p. 18

tion. The Prābhākaras' explanation easily applies to the cases of 'destruction without leaving a trace, but the subsequent knowledge of this cognition's locus (i.e., the soul wherein this knowledge arises) at the same time a knowledge of the destruction of this knowledge [1]

Rāmānujācārya shows the blemish of ad-infinitum in the Bhāṭṭa view as that even the Bhāṭṭas who accept non-apprehension as an additional means of knowledge, cannot maintain that a mere non-origination of knowledge leads to knowledge of non-existence , for- such non-origination takes place even during deep sleep. Again, when after first having not known a particular thing at a particular place we subsequently know this thing at this place, we say 'this thing was not (then) at this place'. Here the knowledge of non-existence must be due to the past non-apprehension recognized as distinct from the present non-apprehension ; for the present non apprehension is now destroyed by the present knowledge (while the past non-apprehension remains as it was) All this goes to show that non-apprehension as known (and not merely non-apprehension as an existent fact) causes knowledge of non-existence. But non-apprehension is itself a non-existence. Hence if the Bhāṭṭa maintains that all knowledge of non-existence is caused by non-apprehension, he will land himself in an infinite regression.[2] For, if knowledge of a non-existence requires a non-apprehension (as known), the knowledge of this non-apprehension will require another non-apprehension (as known) the knowledge of this second non-apprehension will require a third non-apprehension (as known), and so on ad-infinitum So the Prābhākaras do not admit non-existence as a distinct category.

The refutation of non-existence by Prābhākara, who is realist, was more annoying than by the idealist Buddhist who is some way, repudiate even the positive reality.

1 यस्यापि मते प्रध्वसाभावस्स्वीक्रियते··· PP, p 288

2 तथा चानुपलब्धेरप्यभावरूपतया तद्ज्ञानमप्यनुपलभ्यमित्यनवस्था।
TR, p. 19

Sridhara, a famous logician asks Prabhakara: 'What is the basis of support (Ālambana) of the knowledge of non-existence? If Prabhakara say that it is nothing, then Prabhakara himself has lent a helping hand to idealist Buddhists, who hold that ideas have no external basis.[1] Similarly, Jayanta, another well known logician, expresses his sense of shame at the Prābhākaras, who although realists, refuse to accept non-existence as a reality [2]

The Mīmāṃsakas are realists and pluralists The world is not one thing, but consists of many things and each kind belongs to a category. The Bhāṭṭas admit five categories — substance, quality, motion, genus and non-existence. The Prābhākaras accept eight categories — substance, quality, motion, genus, inherence, potency, similarity and number. There is a similarity between the Mīmāṃsakas and the Logicians in their categorization of reality But there are some differences also. The list of the Bhāṭṭas' categories is better than that of the Logicians The Prābhākaras, unlike the Logicians, dismiss non-existence as a distinct category and add three more categories — potency, similarity, and number. With reference to the substance the Bhāṭṭas and the Prābhākaras admit nine - earth, water, light, air, ether, time, space, soul and mind, as the Logicians do and the Bhāttaṣ add two more - darkness and sound, to the list The Prābhākaras say that darkness is only an absence of light, and is not a positive entity Word is only sound, and sound is only a quality. But the Bhāttas distinguish between audible sound, which is a quality, and sound, which is meaningful, and treat it as a substance The Bhāṭṭas divide substances ultimately to traids which are visible and the Prābhākaras, like the Logicians, to atoms which are only inferential. The Bhāttas hold that self is known by the mind along with the object and the Prābhākaras, hold that it is known as the subject of all knowledges of objects.

1 नास्तीति संविद किमालम्बनम् ? ... NK p 229

2 यैस्तु मीमासकैस्सद्भिरभावो नाभ्युपेयते ।
प्रमादेनामुना तेषा वयमप्यद्य लज्जिताः ॥ NM pt 1 p. 57

As regards qualities, the Bhāttas like the Logicians admit 24 while substituting audible sound, manifestedness, potency in places of sound, merit and demerit of the list of the Logicians' qualities. The Prābhākaras admit 22 among 24 of the list of the Logicians' qualities. They say that number is not a quality but a distinct category and substitute Adṛṣṭa in place of merit and demerit. According to the Bhāṭṭas the specific qualities characterising the self are the same as established by the Logicians except merit and demerit Of the remaining six qualities— knowledge, desire, hate, pleasure, pain and volition— the last five are taken to be internally perceivable But knowledges according to the Bhāṭṭas, are inferential and accornding to the Prābhākaras, are self manifesting and according to the Logicians, are perceptible God, supreme- self admitted by the Logicians, but the Mīmāṁsakas do not admit Him With reference to genus, the Mīmāmsakas admit that a genus may be what is common to two more objects, or it may be what endures through two or more phases of changing objects The Logicians admit only the former

The Bhāṭtas do not accept inherence as a distinct category. They say that it is nothing more than the relation of identity-and- difference. The genus is both identical with the particular and also different from it So also is quality identical with and different from substance.

Although the Prābhākaras accept inherence as a distinct category, they mean by it something different from what the Logicians mean. The Logicians define it as an eternal inseparable relation between two entities. The relation between a particular cow and the genus of cow 'cow-ness' is inherence. But the Prābhākaras points out that this relation need not be eternal, it may be transient. When the cow dies, the relation vanishes ; if it is eternal, the cow will never die. The Prābhākaras define inherence as only dependence. The cow is dependent on the genus, cowness, for its being a cow, and the cow-ness depends, on the cow for its existence. Similarly, a quality depends for its existence on its own substance.

The Bhāṭṭas, like the Logicians, unlike the Prābhākaras, do not accept potency, similarity and number as distinct categories and do accept non-existenee as a category It is of four kinds — prior, posterior, mutual and absolute. A body before its birth is prior non-existent in the world and a jar which is broken has posterior non-existence. Instances of mutual non-existence can be furnished by the fact that the cow is non-existent in the horse and the horse is non-existent in the cow The barren women's son is an ideal example of absolute non-existence.

The Prābhākaras say that there is nothing called non-existence, existing in the world. Whatever exists is positive only. Before the pot comes into existence there is not non-existence of the pot, but only the èxistence of clay, with which the pot is made. Posterior non-existence is the negation of the pot after it is broken up. The Prábhākaras ask that then what is called posterior non-existence, is really the existence of pieces of pot ? or of mere clay ? Absolute non-existence is, for instance, the absence of a particular book on the table. This book is present in the book shelf, but absent in every other place and these places are infinite. It is therefore called absolute non-existence. The Prābhākaras say that the non-existence of a particular book on the table is really the existing table. Mutual non-existence is the negation of two objects by each other It is differenoe only For example, the cow and the horse are different from each other and so negate each other , the cow is not a horse and the horse is not a cow. But this negation, according to the Prābhākaras, is only the existence of objects, and it is nothing more

